GOVERNMENT

OF

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

ZONING COMMISSION

CONTINUED PUBLIC MEETING

THURSDAY MAY 13, 2004

The Regular Meeting of the District of Columbia Zoning Commission convened at 6:30 p.m. in the Office of the Zoning Hearing Room at 441 4th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001, Carol J. Mitten, Chairperson, presiding.

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

CAROL J. MITTEN

Chairperson Vice Chairperson Member ANTHONY J. HOOD

KEVIN HILDEBRAND GREGORY JEFFRIES Member

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

ALBERTO P. BASTIDA Secretary
SHARON SCHELLIN Zoning Specialist

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

ELLEN McCARTHY Deputy Director JOHN FONDERSMITH Office of Planning

D.C. OFFICE OF CORPORATION COUNSEL:

MARY NAGELHOUT, ESQ.

A-G-E-N-D-A

Hearing Action			
Z.C. Case No. 02-26 (The George Washington			
University/Lerner Health and Wellness center -			
Square 42, Lot 847)			
Jerry Moore	6		
Charles Barber			
Nicole White			
Tony Vecchione			
Office of Planning Report			
John Fondersmith 5	3		
Ellen McCarthy 6	1		
ANC Report			
Dorothy Miller	_		
Persons or Organizations in Support of the Application			
Cynthia Jackles 9	3		
Persons or Organizations in Opposition of the Application			
Barbara Spillinger	С		
Rebuttal by Applicant	_		
Jerry Moore	3		
Closing Statement			
Jerry Moore	4		

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

6:37 p.m.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. This is a public hearing of the Zoning Commission of the District of Columbia for Thursday, May 13, 2004.

My name is Carol Mitten and joining me this evening are Vice-Chairman Anthony Hood and Commissioners Kevin Hildebrand and Greg Jeffries.

The subject of this evening's hearing is Case No. 02-26. This is a request by the George Washington University for special exception relief pursuant to Sections 210 and 3104 of the Zoning Regulations 11DCMR for further processing under an existing campus plan to amend the Board of Zoning Adjustment's March 31, 1998 Order No. 16276.

Testimony and evidence submitted at this evening's hearing will be confined to the submissions requested by the Zoning Commission on February 19, 2004. Notice of today's hearing was published in the D.C. Register on March 19, 2004. Copies of the hearing announcement are available to you and are located in the wall bin near the door.

Please be advised that this proceeding is being recorded by a court reporter and is also

being webcast live. Accordingly, we must ask you to refrain from making any disruptive noises or actions in the hearing room.

When presenting information to the Commission, please turn on and speak into the microphone on the table in front of us, first stating your name and home address. When you are finished speaking, please turn your microphone off so that your microphone is no longer picking up sound or background noise.

This hearing will be conducted in accordance with the provisions of 11 DCMR Section 3104, which are the Rules of Procedure for Special Exceptions. The order of procedure will be as follows.

Preliminary matters followed by the presentation of the Applicant's case, report by the Office of Planning, reports of any other Government agencies, report by the affected Advisory

Neighborhood Commission, in this case it's ANC 2-A, persons in support, persons in opposition, rebuttal by the Applicant.

The following time constraints will be maintained in this hearing. The Applicant will have as many as 30 minutes, but don't feel compelled to

take that long. Organizations will have five minutes. Individuals will have three minutes.

The Commission intends to adhere to these time limits as strictly as possible in order to hear the case in a reasonable period of time.

The Commission reserves the right to change the time limits for presentations if necessary and notes that no time shall be ceded.

All persons appearing before the

Commission are to fill out two witness cards. These

cards on the table near the door. Upon coming

forward to speak to the Commission, please give both

cards to the reporter who is sitting to our right.

The decision of the Commission in this case must be based exclusively on the public record. To avoid any appearance to the contrary, the Commission requests that persons present not engage the members of the Commission in conversation during a recess or at any other time. Staff will be available throughout the hearing to discuss procedural questions and you can direct those to Mr. Bastida or Ms. Schellin.

Please turn off all beepers and cell phones at this time so as not to disrupt these proceedings.

	· ·
1	At this time the Commission will
2	consider any preliminary matters. Mr. Bastida,
3	anything?
4	MR. BASTIDA: The staff has no
5	preliminary matters, Madam Chairman.
6	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Mr. Moore,
7	anything?
8	MR. MOORE: (No audible response.)
9	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right. Anyone
10	else?
11	(No audible response.)
12	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Very good. Would
13	all individuals wishing to testify this evening now
14	rise to take the oath? And, Mrs. Schellin, if you
15	would administer the oath?
16	(The witnesses were sworn.)
17	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Mr. Moore, whenever
18	you'd like to begin.
19	MR. MOORE: Thank you. Good evening,
20	Madam Chairperson and members of the Commission.
21	I'm Jerry Moore of the Law Firm of Venable appearing
22	this evening as counsel to the George Washington
23	University in application No. 02-26, which requests
24	special exception relief under an existing campus
25	plan to amend the conditions set forth in the
	NEAL R. GROSS

Board's 1998 order restricting the classes of users at the Lerner Health and Wellness Center and to allow that same center to remain open until 1:00 a.m. on all days.

This case evolves from an order dated March 31, 1998 in which the Board of Zoning Adjustment unanimously approved the university's application to construct and use the Lerner Health and Wellness Center.

In making that application, the university clearly stated and the Board noted its order that the purpose of the center was to serve the recreational and fitness needs of the university population, including special memberships to the immediate neighbors of the university community and a summer membership program to other. The Board stated in its findings of fact that the university presented evidence and expert testimony to support its contention that the approval of that application will not have an adverse impact on neighboring property because of traffic, especially since most of the users will come from the existing campus population.

The D.C. Office of Planning offered evidence and testimony supporting its recommendation

18

21

20

22

23

24

25

that the application be granted stating that such would be consistent with the approved campus plan, not result in an increase in the number of students, faculty or staff and would not impair the intent, purpose and integrity of the zoning regulations.

This recommendation of approval arose directly from the university's unequivocal statements that the facility was intended for the use of the university community. The Office of Planning report did not recommend the imposition of any conditions.

Crediting this evidence of record, the Board granted the application. However, in so doing the Board found that the purpose of the facility is not to provide athletic uses for neighbors, alumni or anyone else who is not a student, faculty or staff person of the Foggy Bottom campus.

Well, after a year of experience in operating the center, the university filed this application asking the to Zoning Commission to free it from what in practice has proven to be an unreasonable imposition on operating rather than land use policies by placing restrictions on the persons, defined solely by class, who are permitted to participate in the programs offered by the

center.

Since the center opened, the university has been carefully studying who uses the facility, at what times, how many there are and the means by which they arrive. As a consequence, substantial evidence, much of it compiled by experts, has been placed into the record to justify the legitimate zoning-related problems. And to date, there has been no evidence that would support a contrary conclusion. Oh, there are a few respectful few who thing that the university's request is a bad idea, but not one of them has submitted any objective zoning-related facts that would justify their negative conclusions.

This application first sought approval of up to 3,000 more members without regard to class. However, the university responded to a Commission request and categorized and prioritized the new members that were proposed by class in a submission filed in March of 2003.

Also requested in this application is permission to extend the closing hour from 10:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday and 8:30 on Sunday to 1:00 a.m. on all days except Saturday. There is substantial expert evidence already in the record to

demonstrate that those adjustments will not become objectionable to neighboring property because of noise, traffic, number of students or other conditions. That is the unrebutted conclusion of Grove Slade, the university's traffic consultant. The firm of Brailsford & Dunleavy, experts in the field of facilities planning, agreed by written report and by all testimony in the record.

By memorandum dated November 25, 2002, the Office of Planning recommended that the Commission approve the university's request to expand the center's membership by 3,000, but suggested that the closing hour be extended only to 11:30 p.m. on all days. The District Department of Transportation concurred with OP's recommendations. Ten neighborhood residents including an ANC Commissioner for this area and the president of the Remington Condominium Association appeared at the hearing to testify in support of extending the class of members by 3,000 and adjusting the closing hour.

Letters of support from Saint Mary's

Court and Saint Mary's Episcopal Church are in the

record. The School Without Walls also testified in

support of the application. All of this evidence

was submitted in support of 3,000 new members from

the university and neighboring communities.

revised its request downward to extend membership to persons identified by class for convenience and traffic analysis to extend the closing hour to 1:00 a.m. on all days. These revisions have been briefed in the record by the university and reviewed by the Office of Planning and the District Department of Transportation. It is these revisions that are the subject of this second public hearing this evening.

As most of the case is already in the record and because the Commission has specifically limited the scope of the hearing, we have endeavored to organize our presenters in a logical and efficient manner.

First, will present Charles Barber, who you know, who will detail exactly whom the university wishes to offer membership to and the reasons supporting the university's revised downward request. He will also justify the later closing hour that is requested.

Tony Vecchione, the university's assistant athletic director, will speak to the purposes of the center, the current usage patterns and how the center is managed.

Finally, the Commission is familiar with Nicole White of Grove Slate Associates who has undertaken a supplemental traffic, parking and transportation analysis of the area in the context of the revised numbers. Ms. White has qualified by the Commission in this case as an expert witness in the field of traffic and parking analysis. The professional report of Ms. White is in the record, so her purpose this evening will be to highlight its findings and conclusions and to respond to what we feel are some unsubstantiated and erroneous conclusions made in this case by the Office of Planning in its latest report and to answer any questions that the Commission may have.

We trust that you will find our evidence to be substantial, efficiently presented and persuasive.

First, with your leave, I'll call on Mr. Barber to testify.

MR. BARBER: Thank you. Good evening.

We view the nature of the facility as primarily to serve the university population, but also to serve a broader population. Like these types of facilities operate by colleges and universities around the country, we see this health and wellness facility as

an opportunity to make outreach efforts to the local community, as well as to supporters of the university and we think we can operate it as such in a way that does not cause any adverse impact on the surrounding community.

Let me go over the categories of users, but I want to emphasize, we're talking about a total of about 1,300 additional potential new members, not -- we know all these going to use the facility, but that is the universe we're talking about, downward from 3,000.

The first category is immediate neighbors. These are the residents of the Remington, Saint Mary's Court, as well as users of the Saint Mary's Church and the Oddfellows. There are two reasons for this group. One, we went to these people when we wanted to build this building in 1998 and their first question was, "All right. We'll support you if we're allowed to use the facility," and we said, "Fine." We've never been able to make good on that commitment because of the restriction to student, faculty and staff of the Foggy Bottom campus and so we want to make good on that commitment. The second reason to allow this group access is if there were any adverse impact,

and we don't think there is any evidence, or there will be any adverse impact on the surrounding community, but these people will be the ones impacted the most if there were any and so we think it's logical to include them. And we have numbers, Remington and Saint Mary's Court have expressed the most interest, 50, and Saint Mary's Church and the Oddfellows are smaller populations. The total of that group is about 122.

Mount Vernon campus. GW operates a separate campus on Mount Vernon. There are 445 beds on the Mount Vernon campus and 85 faculty and staff. We have a shuttle that goes back from Mount Vernon to Foggy Bottom that operates regularly. Every 10 minutes there's a shuttle running back and forth from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. and it's now operating on a 24-hour basis. It's a very efficient system. It's well utilized. In April alone there was some 68,000 riders. We put a lot of effort into having this system work efficiently and it stops one block from the health and wellness center. So we don't think there will be any problem about allowing Mount Vernon campus people access to this facility.

The third group I want to address is the School Without Walls. School Without Walls, some of

_

you know it, the grant school, District-owned property surrounded by GW property about a block from the campus. We have long had a relationship with the School Without Walls. Some of their students take classes for free at GW. Some of their faculty members take classes. We allow them access to our library and some other services.

We are in discussions with the School Without Walls on a broader relationship that could result in a renovated or new building for the School Without Walls and an expanded relationship between the entities. We may come back to you at a later date on an application to address that particular issue.

But for this issue, what we want to allow is for the possibility for the School Without Walls students, faculty and staff to use the facility if we're able to reach this broader agreement. Again, we don't have that agreement now, but we're looking down the road and when they look at their facilities and want a new or renovated facility, they don't want to have to use valuable academic space for a gymnasium when a block and a half away there is a recreational facility which we're willing to give them access to on an organized

2

3

_

5

6

,

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

basis. We would never have high school students just have free access to a building that has college students. But we thing there's an opportunity for a program to give access to the School Without Walls and so we want to provide for that.

The President's Club. This is an issue that's been given some attention. Let me give it some scope. There are 270 lockers in the health and wellness club for the President's Club and the President's Club will pay a higher fee. They get certain amenities. Twenty-five people use that now. That is 25 people are members of faculty and staff who wanted to pay the higher fee for the President's There are another 100 members of the President's Club who are still at the Smith Center. That's the last piece of recreational use of the Smith Center. The Smith Center has been transitioning into inter-collegiate athletics and so our inter-collegiate athletic teams, our teams, visiting teams now use the Smith Center and the locker rooms and the equipment and all that has been geared towards them. But there are 100 people of the President's Club who still use the Smith Center. If this application is approved, they will transition over to the health and wellness center.

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

They're already in the area, so these are not new people. So we're looking at a total of 145 potential new people to use the health and wellness center in the category of the President's Club.

Now, who are these people? Well, for starters, they're members of our Board of Trustees. We have 44 members of our Board of Trustees and not one of them can use this health and wellness center. There's something wrong with that. There would be other supporters of the university, potential donors and this is the kind of thing I was talking about, and Brailsford & Dunleavy spoke to during the first hearing. This is the kind of thing that a university uses is facility for, to cultivate that relationship because it benefits the university because they support the university financially and otherwise and then that benefits the broader community. If we get more support, we can keep our tuition down, we can offer more D.C. scholarships, we can provide more services to the community. It benefits everyone.

You will hear from the traffic expert that the traffic impact of these 145 new members is no significant. And that's based upon surveys and data that they collected. So we think this is an

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

appropriate category to include.

And the final category is quests of This is a small group. It's about 25 during the week and we figure it will be bigger on the weekends when there's less of an impact, quite frankly, on the weekends, so it could go up to 50 on the weekend. Why are we including this group? mindful of that letter that we submitted in the record the first time around. This is not a letter we solicited. This letter came from a parent that was addressed to the president of the university and he had come down, this father had come down to visit his son who is attending George Washington University and he was so looking forward to spending time with his son playing racquetball and this was an opportunity to bond with him and to spend some quality time with him and he was really looking forward to this visiting weekend. And when he showed up with his son, we had to tell him, "You can't use this facility. We'd like to, but you're not in the categories of permitted users." We should have some way to allow for that intermittent use of people who are associated with current users and that's the idea of the quest policy. Again, we tried to keep those numbers small so we don't think

2

3

_

5

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

it would have an objectionable impact in terms of parking or traffic.

Let me move to hours of operation. We have proposed that the closing hour be moved to 1:00. That may strike you as late, but there are two reasons for that. One, this is what our students want. If anyone has a teenager, you know they're up at that time of the night. Now, are they studying? Yes, they are studying. Are they sleeping? Some are sleeping. But at times, they're also looking for activities, things to do with their energy. This is a good thing to do with their energy. They want to be able to go at 12:00 at night for a pick up game of basketball and why shouldn't they? That's where they should be if they're not in the library. And so we're responding to that request to allow greater access at later hours.

The second reason is that if we open the facility up to later hours, it flattens out the usage curve and allows the university to manage the facility to allow room for these other members. You will hear a proposal tonight that the university does not object to. There is a proposal from some members in the community that says, "In addition to

the immediate neighbors, we should allow space for another 100 members who are residents of Foggy Bottom West End who do not live adjacent to the facility, but are still residents of Foggy Bottom West End." So they don't present any traffic problems. We don't have any objection to that. But, that population as well as the other non-university population, as modest as it is, will be better managed if we can have longer hours.

So there are two reasons for the longer hours, to meet the requests and desires for students who stay up late, as well as to flatten out the curve and so as to allow greater usage of this valuable facility.

There's been raised the issue well, won't there be some disruption of students leaving at 1:00 in the morning? There has never been a complaint that we have received of any noise of students leaving the health and wellness center and if we would have gotten one, it would have come from the people who are supporting this application, the Remington and Saint Mary's Court. We have a letter from the Remington, the property manager, which reiterates the position they took in the first hearing. That letter will be coming for the record.

I won't take the time to read it, but they support the application.

When students leave the health and wellness center, basically they're tired. They want to go home. So there's really no reason for a lot of disruption. If there were and if we did receive complaints, the university has the university police department and we would station police or have patrol cars passing about that time to make sure that there wasn't, you know, any untoward problems.

Finally, the issue that was requested we address was compliance with the campus plan conditions. We have submitted a status report in our March 11 filing that goes down the conditions condition-by-condition and gives a status and we believe we are in substantial compliance with those conditions. If there are any questions on those, I'd be happy to answer them. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you.

MR. MOORE: Thank you, Mr. Barber. With your leave, Madam Chair, I'll just move right along with our witnesses and I'll present all my witnesses for questions.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Please.

MR. MOORE: Next I'll call Nicole White

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

/

please.

MS. WHITE: Good evening, Madam Chair, and members of the Zoning Commission. My name is Nicole White and I'm a senior associate with Grove Slade Associates.

First, let me refresh everyone's memory that we prepared a traffic and parking study back in November of 2002 that looked at traffic and parking impacts with the 3,000 additional health and wellness center members. At that time, we looked at university activity data on a weekly and a daily basis. We conducted mode choice surveys and we did all of this analysis and we were able to conclude that with the 3,000 new members that this would not have an adverse impact on traffic or parking. So recently the university came forth and said, "We'll reduce this number," so obviously we can still conclude that there would be no adverse impact to traffic and parking.

I just wanted to highlight a couple of things from my surveys that Mr. Barber and Mr. Moore have already touched upon. That is, when we conducted our survey back in 2002, we found that only 10 percent of people who used the health and wellness center drive to the health and wellness

center. The remaining 90 percent walk or arrive by transit. Also, we found that only 18 percent of people that use the President's Club at the Smith Center drive and the rest of them walk or use transit. Another important percentage to throw out at you is that on any given day only 13 percent of the total health and wellness center membership uses the health and wellness center. So what that says is what we all know, is people who have gym memberships do not go to the gym every day. I think we all know that. I can attest to that.

So, we looked at the five user categories. Most of them are within the immediate residential area and then we have the President's Club, which I already said that only 18 percent of them would drive. Only 30 percent of them will be there at any one time. And so from that, we know that only a small amount of additional traffic will be generated by this use. So we were able to conclude with confidence that this would not have any adverse impact due to traffic and parking.

I just want to touch on one thing and reiterate the importance of the Mount Vernon shuttle. Charles talked about 68,000 users in the month of March. They've had close to 500,000 users

1 per year in the past two years. Also, the importance of the frequent shuttle runs, 15-minute 2 and 20-minute increments, helps to contribute to 3 that 500,000 per year usage. I think that's it. 5 Finally, I did want to also let you know that DDOT has supported this application and they 6 agree that it will have no adverse impact on traffic 8 and parking. 9 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. 10 MR. MOORE: Thank you, Ms. White. Next 11 I'll call Tony Vecchione. Mr. Vecchione, would you identify 12 yourself for the record please? 13 MR. VECCHIONE: Hi, my name is Tony 14 15 Vecchione. I'm the assistant athletic director for 16 facilities and operations and I have the oversight for the Lerner Health and Wellness Center and the 17 Smith Center for the operation of those buildings. 18 And basically, I just wanted to touch 19 20 base a little bit on the usage patterns or the usage 21 pattern of the Lerner Health and Wellness Center. 22 The building peak hours that we found, 23 and from the studies, have been Monday through Wednesday from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. Those are the most 24 25 heavily used time periods. The other days, the

weekends and the summers are a lot lighter.

The late hours are extremely important to our students' lifestyle. Believe it or not, they really do work out at that time at night and they prefer that rather than early in the morning the way some of our staff do, the 6:00 a.m. or the 7:00 a.m. time. And also, our intramural participation is a lot heavier after 6:00 p.m. and they'd rather go as late as we can let them and the hours actually limit the amount of teams and the people that are able to participate. So again, the late hour is very important to our student lifestyle.

The center is basically managed with an ID system and we use our G World ID system, which is a magnetic strip reader-type of situation. Because of that magnetic reader, it allows us to be able to count the number of people that use the facility, the different populations, how many times people use the facility, as well as we're able to supply reports to that fact and how people use it and how many people use it and those type of things.

There is one access point, which is the main lobby off of G Street. We do have the opportunity or the ability to have a second access point, which is off the garden in the back. We do

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

not use that, but we can use that and we could do
the same type of magnetic strip reader situation so
we can always count and monitor the people that are
using the facility.

Crowd control. When we talk about crowd control of the facility, we talk about moving people when it gets crowded or it starts to have a heavy use. We have over 700 pieces of cardio and weight equipment in the building. We have one main area with the cardio and weight equipment on the main floor, but we have three other floors in the building that have pieces of cardio equipment on it. When the facility starts to get heavily used in that one area, we have graduate students and we have part-time staff that actually are able to move the people to other areas and recommend to them that, you know, there's equipment on other floors of the building that are not being used and they should move to those areas, as well as we have a sign-up list that they can use on the main floor so that they can, you know, be able to use the equipment so they're not all backed up and not all backlogged.

Also, what we found is that people learn how to use the building. When it's crowded, they don't come at that time to use the building and

1 people will find their only little niche on when it's best for them to be able to use it, which kind 2 of helps to balance it out. 3 We have not had any problems with noise. 5 We have not had any problem with numbers of students or traffic. We haven't had any problems with people 6 congregating outside the building. When we close, they do leave. They just go from there. 8 And the only other thing I wanted to say 9 10 was that we really want to be able to or we really would like to be able to service the university 11 12 community. We have not had that opportunity yet and our recreation department which runs our wellness 13 department has a lot of classes and a lot of 14 15 programs they run and would really like to share 16 that with the university community and especially or surrounding local neighbors. I think that's it. 17 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: 18 Thank you. 19 MR. MOORE: Ms. Mitten, those are my witnesses for this specialized hearing this evening. 20 I'll present each of them at once for questions from 21 the Commission. 22 23 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Thank you. 24 Any questions? Mr. Hildebrand? 25 COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: Actually, I do

have a question. In your evaluation of how the facility is used, and perhaps this is best for the athletic director, have you taken a forward looking view to when the new dormitories come on line and what your projected population will be two years from now as opposed to last year?

MR. VECCHIONE: We have. We've taken that into consideration and we can more than handle the number of students that would be able to use the space.

COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: Can you provide us diagrams of what you're projecting as the future use like you've given us for the current use?

MR. BARBER: Yes, we can give you our best guesstimates on that. And let me respond, we took that into consideration and downsizing the request from 3,000 to 1,300. We realized that consistent with the direction give us by the BZA to increase on-campus housing that we would have more students on campus. So in a general fashion we took that into consideration, but if you want us to make a projection of numbers going forward, we can provide you with something.

MR. MOORE: I might add, Mr. Hildebrand, that because these dormitories are located nearby, I

think it's fair to assume that they would be walking, so as not to cause a traffic impact of any kind.

COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: Yes. No, I'm aware of that.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Anyone else, questions? Mr. Hood?

VICE-CHAIR HOOD: Mr. Barber, I'm just curious, your Board of Trustees, how did they become excluded? Was there ever a pitch to try to get them involved early on, or how did that even happen?

MR. BARBER: Well, the university came in with no limitations on users. I mean, we thought we could manage this facility in a way that included the population we thought who should have access and that's how we presented our case. At the end of the case, this is the 1998 case, we were a little bit surprised when the condition came down that it would be restricted to students, faculty and staff for the Foggy Bottom campus. We really didn't think there wa a lot of testimony. It was roughly based upon traffic impact, but there wasn't a lot of testimony on that. So, that's how it happened. And our trustees are neither students, facility, nor staff.

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

was just a kind of byproduct of that condition.

MR. MOORE: Let me add to that.

VICE-CHAIR HOOD: Sure. Please.

MR. MOORE: Because I handled that case. This case was brought in 1998 to build and construct the center and as has become regular with university applications, there were a number of people in the audience who didn't think that constructing the health and wellness center was a very good idea.

The university put forth in that case what I believe to be substantial evidence that the purposes of the center would be to serve the entire university community. The Office of Planning submitted a report which agreed with that and recommended that the BZA at the time approve that application in full as submitted. At the end of the day, however, I think, at the public meeting, BZA reached a compromise and they decided to permit the university to build the center and to open the center, but as a compromise, in my view, some of the members thought that the opposition should be given some limitation. So a limitation on the number of members and the classes of members was imposed upon the university. I still can't figure it out to this day after having reviewed the record numerous times,

1 but that's how it happened. VICE-CHAIR HOOD: Okay. This, forgive 2 me, doesn't have an exhibit number, you're now 3 asking for it to stay open until 1:00 and I believe 5 this is the current use of the facility now, and I'm holding up a chart which is seven days a week. 6 when I look at this chart, like any typical or 8 health and wellness center, the like, when I look at this chart, looking at this chart and trying to make 9 10 an informed decision doesn't warrant being open 11 until 1:00. And if you can expound on that. When I look at this card, at 10:00 on Sunday it looks like 12 nobody's in there. You close now at 10:00, right? 13 14 MR. BARBER: Yes. 15 VICE-CHAIR HOOD: Well, let me just say from 9:30 to -- why not close at 9:00? Is it 16 feasible to stay open until 10:00, from looking at 17 this chart? 18 19 MR. BARBER: The question, is it 20 feasible to stay open until later on? 21 VICE-CHAIR HOOD: Yes, I'm --22 MR. BARBER: And you're looking at a 23 Sunday, which is a day of particular low usage. VICE-CHAIR HOOD: Let me rephrase it. 24 25 From a building standpoint.

2

3

5

6

•

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BARBER: Yes.

VICE-CHAIR HOOD: From looking at this chart, it's not feasible to stay open until 10:00, or 9:00 actually. 9:00 would be the cut-off point, from looking at what you all submitted.

MR. BARBER: On Sunday? I see what you're saying. This is a Sunday, which shows, you know, low usage and falls off. And that is, quite frankly, our lowest day. What we would like and what we think makes sense is with the authority to stay open until 1:00, many times it will be, we believe, based upon what we've heard from our students, that it will be well used. Not the high numbers as the 6:00 to 8:00, but still well used into the later hours of the night. If we find on a Sunday that the use drops off so significantly after 10:00 or 11:00, then as an operational matter, we will close it. But we think we should have that kind of flexibility to meet what is told to us what students want. And some students would work out late even on a Sunday, even though those numbers might be later -- I mean, might be less than a late night on some other day of the week.

COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Mr. Barber?

MR. BARBER: Yes.

NEAL R. GROSS

COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: In terms of surveys, I mean, I assume that when you're talking about discussions or from students about wanting, you know, later hours, that was done in like a survey or how did you actually measure this demand?

MR. BARBER: I can't say that we actually conducted surveys. We have operated this facility over two years and we've had numerous discussions, focus groups, feedback from our users and this topic repeatedly comes up.

COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: But so it's not really documented in like written form any anything?

MR. BARBER: I'd have to ask --

COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Oh, okay.

MR. VECCHIONE: In the sense of a survey, no, we have not done that. It's basically use patterns and use patterns that also have been guided from the Smith Center, the former facility. You know, some of the patterns that you would see on those charts, they could definitely be expanded with the intramural program. You know, right now the intermural program is not being scheduled on those nights or on certain days, or whatever because of how and when the facility closes. But right now we are getting questions. They're asking us, our

recreation department is, you know, "Can we, you know, go later," and no, we can't because of the zoning. Basically there's a heavy use Monday through Thursday for intramurals and now they've just come on that they want to even go on Fridays.

COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okay.

MR. VECCHIONE: So that just came new.

So I guess what I'm trying to say is if we're

allowed the time, we can fill it with intramural use
and that's the pattern that we have found with team
intramural use.

Sure, we will we use it seven days a week for intramural use until 1:00? No, because students like to do other things on say a Saturday night. They like to do other things sometimes on a Thursday night. It just depends on how that trend goes. But I guess what Mr. Barber is saying, we would like the flexibility to be able to say when we could do that and when we can't.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Vecchione, I think I know what Mr. Hood is speaking of and I think he's looking at the diminution of use from say 7:00 down to 11:00 and I think his question is if nobody's coming at 11:00 p.m., why does the center want to be open. I think part of that would be say at 10:00,

1	do people decide that the center will not well,
2	not 10:00, but 9:00, say, do people decide the
3	center's going to close and they leave and are there
4	people on campus who at 9:00 decide, "Well, it's
5	only an hour, so we can't go over there?"
6	MR. VECCHIONE: That's a good point and
7	that's something I should have brought up. When we
8	close at 10:00, we stop letting people come in to
9	use the facility at 9:30. So when we say we close
10	at 10:00, we call it 9:30-10:00. So you know, the
11	use stops a half hour prior to the close. So you
12	would definitely see it tailing off at that time.
13	VICE-CHAIR HOOD: Thank you. My other
14	question, Mr. Barber is the use and I'm concerned
15	about if this, depending upon where this application
16	goes, I believe it's Remington, Saint Mary's, is it
17	Goodfellows or Oddfellows?
18	MR. BARBER: Oddfellows.
19	VICE-CHAIR HOOD: Okay.
20	MR. BARBER: Goodfellows is a movie.
21	VICE-CHAIR HOOD: Oddfellows.
22	MR. BARBER: Gangsters. We're not
23	letting gangsters in.
24	VICE-CHAIR HOOD: But I guess my
25	question is, are we being fair to the people who are

not in these areas? And I don't get over that way too much, unfortunately, but are those significant population in those areas? I guess, in other words, how are we just going to say that these are the people that can use it? What about someone who lives a little further away?

MR. BARBER: Right.

VICE-CHAIR HOOD: And that can be an issue.

MR. BARBER: I appreciate that. And you will hear a request, and there's a representative from the community tonight who will make that very point and it came to our attention after our filing and so this is not something that was in our application. But once it came to your attention, that is that in addition to the immediate neighbors, and I told you the rationale for our immediate neighbors. I mean, they've been there from the beginning with us and we've talked to them because they had the potential of being most directly impacted being adjacent to this facility. So that's why we started with them.

But in the last few weeks, there's been a request that came to our attention that said in addition to those immediate neighbors, you should

allow another 100, again Foggy Bottom West End residents who may live a little farther away have access and we think that's frankly a good idea. We would support that request and again we think particularly with the longer hours we can accommodate even that group without any adverse impacted on the surrounding community.

VICE-CHAIR HOOD: Thank you. And I will say that it's very unfortunate when I look the update on the conditions that the advisory committee has not gotten started yet because that may mitigate and make our jobs a lot easier. And I'll just say that.

MR. BARBER: It is unfortunate.

VICE-CHAIR HOOD: The other thing is the ANC letter. I think it's dated May the 4th. And i don't know, this issue may have been dealt with earlier on, Madam Chair, I don't remember, but there was testimony in the ANC letter and also there was testimony I think at the previous hearing with GW's proposal to expand its membership to include any paying non-university members in violation of the U.S. Tax Code. While that may not be in our jurisdiction, Madam Chair, I would like to have an answer on that because a lot of times we say stuff

is not in our jurisdiction and then it just escalates and it goes on and on and then it creates a problem. So maybe, Mr. Moore, you may be able to answer that.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Hood, that question came up. There's also questions about housing discrimination and the like that were alleged by the ANC and we briefed those issues and the bottom line was, one, there is no violation of the tax code.

Two, there's no violation of the District of Columbia Equal Employment Opportunity Act or -
VICE-CHAIR HOOD: That was satisfied

MR. MOORE: Right. Yes, we briefed all that.

VICE-CHAIR HOOD: Okay.

MR. BARBER: And I will say, in particular on the tax issue, I mean, again this is how these type of facilities operated by colleges and universities all around the country operate. If there were any tax issue, it would be a question UBI, unrelated business income, but it's not a violation and I don't even think this secondary use, this minor use of additional non-university people even creates an unrelated business income issue, but

earlier.

that was fully briefed the first time around.

VICE-CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Good.

MR. MOORE: One of the things we said,
Mr. Hood, was that the university's bookstores, the
university's hospital, their other retail facilities
within the university operate the same way and open
to the public. The only difference between those
and this is this one has restrictions on numbers of
people coming in. But insofar as unrelated business
income or violation of the tax code, the hospital
would have to be in violation of the tax code, the
bookstore, the library, all of those that sell wares
would be in violation of the tax code. So we felt
that there was no violation whatsoever of the tax
code and that was alleged by one of the health club
owners over at 22nd and M Street, N.W. and we shot
that down.

VICE-CHAIR HOOD: Good point. Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair.

COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: I do have a follow-up question on that. What are the access to other facilities in the neighborhood that residents could use? I'm just worried about taking business from other viable District businesses whose only sole income is the health club industry.

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2021

22

23

24

25

25

MR. BARBER: This was an issue that was

brought up in the first hearing and I'm not sure how

valid it was, but in scaling down our request from

an additional 3,000 members and the issue was

raised, "Well, you're opening this to Foggy Bottom

West End at large and opening your doors, then this

could have an impact on these other businesses."

One of the reasons for scaling back on this request

and quite frankly limiting the number of residents

is partly to address that concern. And so now we're

not opening up to Foggy Bottom West End generally.

There are discreet populations. Immediate neighbors

and if the other proposal, another 100 would be

accepted and we don't think that would have any

impact on other establishments, if that's a valid

issue.

MR. MOORE: And, Mr. Hildebrand, let me

add to it. There was testimony at the first hearing

from some of the community resident who recognized

the price differential between the club at the Ritz-

Carlton at 22nd and M Streets N.W. and the president

of that club incidently appeared here, flew down

from Boston to appear here and the residents were

not particularly thrilled about the cost to them of

using that club and they was a fair number of them

who wanted to use the health and wellness center, but as of this point the university is not able to offer that benefit.

Speak a little bit about the current use by Mount
Vernon campus students of the health and wellness
center? I've read somewhere in preparation for the
hearing today that students who utilized classroom
space in Foggy Bottom are allowed because they're
charged a fee as part of their tuition to use the
health and wellness center. What percentage of the
Mount Vernon campus does that represent?

MR. BARBER: Well, it varies from year to year because as we schedule our courses and how many courses we can schedule at Foggy Bottom as opposed to how many we can schedule at Mount Vernon. There's now a push to schedule more courses at Mount Vernon. I think next fall it will go up to about 200 courses and so it does vary. But, most of the current residents, some 300, had to take at least one course at Foggy Bottom.

COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: So you're saying that everyone at Mount Vernon, the students now have access to the fitness center --

MR. BARBER: No, not everyone. I said

1	most of those students do take
2	COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: Three hundred
3	of 330?
4	MR. BARBER: Right. Right.
5	COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: Okay. So
6	basically everyone from Mount Vernon currently is
7	using the fitness facility except for 30 and the
8	faculty?
9	MR. BARBER: No, those people take a
10	class at Foggy Bottom and since the fee is tied onto
11	the health and wellness center, it's tied to the
12	tuition for the class at Foggy Bottom. Then they
13	have access to the extent that they take the class
14	and I said that number varies from year to year.
15	For this spring, we looked at that number and it was
16	about 300.
17	COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: So that's
18	almost all of the students there? Is that true for
19	the faculty as well? Do most of the faculty teach
20	at Foggy Bottom as well as Mount Vernon campus?
21	MR. BARBER: There are I would say about
22	half and half that teach both and then a cadre half
23	would teach solely on the Mount Vernon campus.
24	COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: So what you're
25	saying basically is that including the Mount Vernon

19

23

24

25

campus into your numbers that you're projecting right now would have no impact whatsoever because they're already in your numbers?

MR. BARBER: Many of them are. Not all of them. But yes, there would not be a significant impact because and this is, quite frankly, something that we hadn't focused on until we saw the numbers who were taking classes here and how many of those resided at Mount Vernon. But yes, particularly since with the shuttle they've had very little impact and they have had access, particularly this past semester. Now that could change. If this rule didn't change, then there would be more courses at Mount Vernon next year and there would be some who would take no classes and might not have access and we don't think there's any adverse impact by allowing any of those Mount Vernon students and faculty and staff to use this facility.

COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Excuse me. Moore, I have a question. In your opening statement the order talked about special memberships. Is that a defined term? What defines "special memberships?"

MR. MOORE: I think I was speaking to friends of the university. That is, friends of the president, friends and supporters of the university

at the discretion of the president. There are a cadre of people who are supporters of the university who don't have the ability to use the facility and as a business matter it's nice to be able if Donald Trump's going to fly down here and talk to the president and wants to use the club, right now the answer is no, can't.

COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: So, in terms of special memberships, those were not spelled out in the order in terms of donors and different individuals?

MR. MOORE: The order specified faculty, staff and students of the Foggy Bottom campus, period. That's it.

COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okay.

MR. MOORE: No one else.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I just had one question or one request, I guess. Attached to your submission is the rundown of compliance with the conditions? And for Condition 10, it's the position of corporation counsel, and if you'd like to hear that directly from them, Ms. Nagelhout can say it, but that the stay's been lifted for Condition 10 and this submission really doesn't address compliance with Condition 10. So if you could --

MR. BARBER: Speak to that?

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: -- speak to that or submit something. It's up to you.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$ BARBER: I'm prepared to speak to it tonight.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.

MR. BARBER: We have two issues on Condition 10 and as you know, Ms. Mitten, and as the other Commissioners may not know, the BZA issued an order on remand on Condition 10 and let me just give a little bit of background. Condition 10 of the campus plan order required the university to house freshman and sophomores with certain carve outs in university residence halls on campus.

We had challenged this condition in court, along with other conditions. The issue was we have proffered that the requirement be to house them in university residence halls and the condition came down university residence halls on campus and specifically what we call HOVA, Hall of Virginia Avenue, located on Virginia Avenue, was only designed to be used for freshman because it doesn't have cooking facilities and we use that as a freshman residence hall. The court took a look at this and they initially stated in July and then when

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

they came out with their order on September the 11th, they upheld the condition, but said, "We're going to continue the stay because we think a resolution of this issue is in the best interest of justice and so we're going to continue this stay and leave it for the zoning authorities to deal with it on remand."

We looked at and we thought the Board of Zoning Adjustment was going to deal with it on the remand. When we got the order, I think it was dated April 26, the BZA cites that language from the court that we think that dealing with this is in the best interest of justice, but then it says, "We take no action on remand." So our interpretation is that the stay is still in place because the stay was put in there pending action on remand and by the language of the BZA order it specifically says, "We take no action on Condition 10."

There is another point. Even if you think the stay is lifted, for this fall, we don't think it's an issue because the language of the condition says, "House freshman and sophomores on campus to the extent housing is available." At this stage, even, you know, certainly the stay was in effect until April 26. We think it's still in

15

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

effect. But even if it was lifted April 26, by that time, there was no more housing available on campus. We've assigned housing for the fall. That process starts in December when we start getting early admissions requests. It really kicks in in high gear in February and March when returning students indicate where they want to stay and we've made all assignments. We've received deposits. And so for this fall, there's no housing on campus available for those freshman that we have now assigned to Hall on Virginia Avenue. So for those two reasons we think we are in compliance with the order.

We realize this is an issue we need to deal with. We realize going forward that even if there's no housing available for this fall, going forward this is an issue that needs to be dealt with. What the BZA did was when it says it took not action on this, it deferred us to the Zoning Commission. They said, "You're before the Zoning Commission on other issues. If you have further issues under the campus plan, you really should take them to the Zoning Commission."

This is one of those issues we're going to bring before to this body. We think it calls into consideration some other issues that need to be

addressed under the campus plan, the whole issue of
the off-campus residence halls, but we would like to
file a case that addresses that issue. So we're not
ducking the issue by any means. We plan to bring a
case before you that will address that issue. But
as of now, we think we are in compliance either
because the stay is still in effect, by your reading
of the order, or even if the stay is lifted by the
terms of the condition, no housing is available
given how universities operate. And this is not
peculiar to GW. We all make assignments in the
spring for the fall and those assignments are made.
CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. Anyone
else? Ms. Miller, questions? Would you just
identify yourself?
MS. MILLER: I'm going to do that.
CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
MS. MILLER: I'm Dorothy Miller, chair
of ANC 2-A and I live at 2440 Virginia Avenue, N.W.,
a block away from this mess.
And, Mr I want to ask the lawyer a
question about he said the bus stops a block away
from the whereabouts does the bus stop load and
unload?

asking
ify
c do
ey take
:'s
raffic
raffic e. We
e. We
e. We igned
e. We igned
e. We igned or
e. We igned or
e. We igned or
e. We igned or
e. We igned or
e. We igned or my
i

1 President's Club. And because that number is such a small amount, we didn't have to do what you have 2 typically seen before you, the level of service 3 analysis at each of the intersections. What happens 5 is you look at the order of magnitude of the impacts of something. If the order of magnitudes are so 6 small, jurisdictions don't require you to go through 7 that level of detail of analysis and that's why DDOT 8 supported our analysis without going into the detail 9 10 of the traffic, you know, associated with the 11 Kennedy Center. 12 MS. MILLER: You haven't even looked 13 at --14 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Would you turn on 15 your microphone? And are you asking a question? 16 MS. MILLER: I'm going to ask a question. 17 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right. 18 19 MS. MILLER: I'm trying to get to it. 20 The current plan is to have all of the Kennedy Center traffic dumped on Virginia Avenue. So what I 21 22 was asking, did you take that into consideration and 23 obviously you didn't because what you've done is taken into consideration only what is current, not 24 25 what is coming down.

1 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Is she accurate in saying that you did not take into consideration the 2 change in traffic pattern on Virginia Avenue? 3 MS. WHITE: We did not do any specific 5 counts or projections of that. We looked at the order of magnitude of the expected increase. And 6 because that was such a small order of magnitude 7 8 compared to the downtown urban traffic with 3,000 peak-hour trips versus eight trips that this would 9 10 generate that's distributed throughout the network, 11 then it's not necessary to do a full blown traffic 12 impact analysis that we would typically do for some brand new development. 13 14 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. 15 MS. MILLER: Mr. Barber, do you all give 16 diplomas from Mount Vernon University? 17 MR. BARBER: No. MS. MILLER: I didn't think so. 18 19 MR. BARBER: Okay. 20 MS. MILLER: The other thing is, aren't 21 you currently having racquetball sport competition at the health and wellness club which you all said 22 23 you would not have any competitive sports there? MR. VECCHIONE: We do not have any 24 25 competitive sports competitions at the health and

1	wellness center.
2	MS. MILLER: Then the Hatchet is wrong
3	in saying that you do?
4	MR. MOORE: He's answered the question,
5	Ms. Miller.
6	MS. MILLER: Not, correctly, but are
7	you aware that the Remington is a commercial
8	project? It's not a residential project and they're
9	not fulfilling their license? They're supposed to
10	be a residential place, and they're not.
11	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: What's the
12	question?
13	MS. MILLER: The question is, are they
14	aware that the Remington is a commercial project,
15	not a residential building?
16	MR. BARBER: No, I'm not aware of that.
17	MS. MILLER: Well, that's what it is.
18	Okay. And if you only open up, as our ANC
19	Commissioner suggested, to 100 people, wouldn't that
20	be discriminating against some by refusing some and
21	opening to some? You'd have to justify who you
22	approved and who you didn't approve? I would call
23	that discrimination, wouldn't you?
24	MR. BARBER: The facility is already
25	restricted by a zoning order. We think the type of

	53
1	categories of users, if this application is
2	approved, that would be permitted to use the
3	facility, would not be violation of any anti-
4	discrimination law.
5	MS. MILLER: It would be if you select
6	and choose, wouldn't it?
7	MR. BARBER: I do not think so. Just
8	the fact that you select and choose does not make it
9	discriminatory in violation of law.
10	MS. MILLER: That's strange. You all
11	said that about the campus plans.
12	MR. BARBER: Was that a question?
13	MS. MILLER: I think that will do that
14	for now because I can add to my testimony.
15	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. All
16	right. Thank you, all.
17	We're now to move to the report by the
18	Office of Planning. Mr. Fondersmith?
19	MR. FONDERSMITH: Good evening, Madam
20	Chairman, members of the Zoning Commission. I'm
21	John Fondersmith, Development Review Specialist in
22	the Office of Planning and I'll present the Office
23	of Planning report on this case. With me is Ellen
24	McCarthy, Deputy Director of the Office of Planning.
25	You have our written report and the

attached graphics and materials that incorporates some material with appropriate updates from the initial Office of Planning report in 2002.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And because we have had a chance to review it, if you could just hit the high points, that would be great.

MR. FONDERSMITH: I will then. Our summary recommendations are on page 2 and are outlined then in the table on page 17. And we recommend that George Washington University be allowed to offer memberships to certain classes of users. That's the Mount Vernon campus students, faculty and staff, adjacent residents, adjacent institutions and the School Without Walls. And these are the classes among the classes that the university requested. And that number comes out to 1,021 potential new members. It doesn't mean there would actually be that many, but potential new members. That is therefore excluding in our recommendation additional members of the President's Club.

Now, I think this has been certainly is in the material and I think was alluded to. There are some members of the President's Club now that are using the facility because they are faculty

members and they of course could, in that class, keep on using it. And we do not recommend opening up to visitors primarily because we see that as beginning to change the nature of the facility.

In terms of hours, we recommend allowing the wellness center to remain open until 11:30 on all days. That was our previous position. There is this thing, the question that was alluded to about use. We think that is a reasonable time to remain open.

And then we recommend that the revised conditions be limited to some period, we suggested three years, because we do believe that with the new residence halls opening, especially the Ivory Tower residence hall right next door, eventually the new residence hall several blocks away that was approved Monday night, that we may see a shift in utilization and of course there would be the experience of these new classes of users also if the Zoning Commission agrees to allow them.

And so as I say, our recommendations are summarized in the table on page 17 where we try to indicate what we said before and the consistency of that. Now, in some cases, because the university has scaled back, these overall numbers are lower

2

3

4

5

6

/

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

than they were proposed to be by the university two years ago. We did not embrace all of that before, but this is a lowering.

In our presentation or in arriving for this, I really wanted to really focus on the location of the wellness center and the adjacent patterns of development. You have the aerial photos and the oblique photos in the report and you can see there, just looking at those photos, which one is a year ago and one is two years ago, you get a sense of the change that's happening in this corridor. Major development by George Washington University. The Ivory Tower residence hall across the street, the town house residence hall, which is now complete, the business school, which is under construction, the relatively minor Smith Hall renovation and expansion and of course in the top of the photograph, the new hospital and the site where the existing hospital has been demolished. You also see in those photographs the proximity of the adjacent neighborhood that would be impacted if there is impact from the facility. There would also be some impact of course to the east, but we think the main impact to the extent that -- of an impact is in the residential area of apartments and town

2

3

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

houses to the west of 24th Street.

So, we then worked through our framework for analysis. We wanted to make the point that although we recognize the university's concerns about usage of the facility, that the impact on the neighborhood from a zoning standpoint is really our primary concern. Secondly, that it is a student facility primarily and that students should have a priority to be able to use it. We think it's appropriate to reach out to nearby residents as long as this doesn't create a problem and interfere with students.

We stress the need for sensitive management of the center. The Zoning Commission in one way or another can outline general parameters, but the university really has the opportunity to find tailor through their management practices, and they've talked to some of these tonight, to ensure that there is virtually no impact. So we think that's an important thing for the Commission to stress to the university.

And finally, we did suggest this threeyear limit to evaluate any impacts from these changes.

I should have mentioned of course, and

it was mentioned before, the proximity of the School Without Walls and the relatively short distance they would have to walk to use the center.

We can go into additional detail if you'd like about the classes of users. One of the things that we had raised with the university and it's good to get out on the table clear tonight is the fact that of the Mount Vernon students, a great many of them are at least eligible to use the center today.

And the residents of adjacent buildings, I mean, as you can see from your map, both Remington and Saint Mary's Court, one's right across the street and the other one is right around the corner. So certainly all those people, we think in almost all cases, would walk. The adjacent institutions are a little not as clear because those residents, the Saint Mary's Church and the Oddfellows, they don't necessarily have to be residents of the community. They might be coming in from someplace else. I think as the traffic report indicated, they might be therefore driving in to use it. But the numbers that the university has requested are relatively low, 10 to each of those facilities, and probably in most cases, they would be using it when

they were there on church business or Oddfellows lodge business.

The President's Club members are the ones -- it that may be that the numbers are not that great, but in terms of the driving and impacts, that's where you would potentially get the most impact in terms of automobile impact at least. And so we did not recommend opening that membership up except for, as we say, there are some facility members who are also members of the President's Club.

The School Without Walls, clearly it's a little over a block away. Impact there would be limited.

And the visitors, while a relatively small number was proposed by the university, we thought that was another step in changing the nature of the facility.

I think those are the main points. Let me just mention then the two issues about the squash team and opening at 6:00 in the morning. Both of these had come up in the previous hearing and at that time we said that we did not have any problem with that. We did not think opening the facility at 6:00 in the morning would be a big problem. We

21

22

23

24

25

simply think that the Commission needs to kind of recognize that so that this ambiguity is not floating out there. The previous order is what the university is relying on. The previous order is simply not clear. It deals with closing times, but not opening times. So we would suggest that that be

And on the squash team, what the university has indicated to us in reply to questions, is that there's been some practice of the squash team in the center, but not yet any intercollegiate activities. We said before and we hold to this view, we don't think that's a problem. We've gone and looked at it. They're very nice facilities and it's certainly not a spectator sport kind of situation. You've got a hallway there and the squash courts opening off that. I suppose some squash fanatics could, a few could gather in the hallway and watch, but it's not a spectator kind of thing. We don't think that's going to create a problem. So that's the same kind of thing. I would just, from your standpoint, be good to recognize that and to clarify it.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right. Thank you. Any questions?

clarified.

MS. McCARTHY: Madam Chair, I just wanted to summarize and emphasize just a few of our key points.

recommendation is this is a high-intensity use. It is located at the fringe of the campus. It's a block and a half to two blocks from a low-scale residential historic neighborhood which, by virtue of being historic, has very limited parking. We're concerned because the facility was built with very limited parking, 140 spaces that are not 140 spaces reserved for the wellness center. That 140 spaces is part of the university's overall parking number and it serves night students and people who are coming to campus for campus purposes as well.

The peak hour when people use the facility between 6:00 and 8:00 p.m. also happens to be the peak hour when residents are coming home and are looking for parking on the street. You've got the practical capacity of the center, according to the university's information, at 675, but the President's Club alone, the members not already permitted to use the facility, as I believe, if I do the math right, in at least one place, 245 members, so as a portion of the practical capacity of the

center, it's a fairly large number. The university has argued that they want to open up the facility because they have extra space, although as our report pointed out before, the university was figuring they were at 12 percent utilization two years ago before the dorm opened up across the street. They haven't updated those numbers, I don't believe, but the Brailsford & Dunleavy report indicated that 15 to 25 percent is a typical kind of utilization. So our feeling at the time and our feeling now is that the facility was already close to what would be typical utilization without the beds opening next door with over 700 that are right across the street that will be opening this fall.

The classes of members that we've recommended, Saint Mary's and the Remington, no parking demand, they're right next door, and not generally peak hour users. Mount Vernon, no parking demand. Maybe peak hour, maybe not. School Without Walls, no parking demand. Generally off peak users. I assume predominantly when the students would finish school at 2:00 or 3:00 in the afternoon. President's Club, most likely to drive, most likely to use during peak hours. And the university's argument that they need to allow members of the

24

25

President's Club because that's the way to court donors flies in the face of the fact that if you are wealthy enough to be giving money to the university, presumably you have access to other health care facilities. It's not clear why this would be critical to getting donors to the university and our concern is were this to now to become a benefit of joining the President's Club, then those people who are most interested in utilizing the health facility will see this is a relatively inexpensive tax deductible way to give money to the President's Club and become users of the facility. So those are the reasons that we were particularly concerned about the President's Club. We thought the other users, because they wouldn't be generating a traffic demand and/or, as the university's original rationale was, because they are inconvenienced by the facility and therefore are the ones that deserve to get the benefit of the facility, that that made a lot of sense as a rationale. So, just wanted to summarize Mr. Fondersmith's report and sort of give you the key reasons why the Office of Planning made those conclusions. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. Any questions from the Commission for either Ms.

1 McCarthy or Mr. Fondersmith? COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: Yes, I had a 2 question. Were you surprised in preparing this 3 report to find the number of students from Mount 5 Vernon campus that were currently the facility and is that in the spirit of the original agreement? 6 MR. FONDERSMITH: You mean in the --8 COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: The original 9 BZA agreement to use the facility. 10 MR. FONDERSMITH: To limit -- you know 11 the original --12 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Would you turn on your microphone? 13 14 MR. FONDERSMITH: Yes, I'm sorry. To 15 limit it to Foggy Bottom. Well, it's a -- it of 16 course is bringing in a new group of students and we had asked the university about this and really just 17 heard the number as you did tonight. To be fair, 18 from the university's standpoint, they have certain 19 20 programs where those students are taking courses and using in some way the Foggy Bottom facility. 21 We were concerned before, and we made a 22 23 bigger point of it, about the need for an adequate shuttle transportation system. The university has 24 25 placed in the record this time, I don't think it was

as clear last time, although perhaps it existed, has placed in the record this time information about the shuttle system and it's a pretty frequent system.

We would suggest that the Commission make the point that if there is a problem there that that shuttle system may need to be augmented in some way. I appears to be a pretty significant system.

MS. McCARTHY: But to get back to the surprise part of your question, I think we knew that those students who were at Mount Vernon and also went to Foggy Bottom could use this facility already. I don't think we knew that it was -- we were surprised to find out it was that high a percentage of those students and that the intensity of the use, 68,000 students in one month, comes to about over 2,200 a day using that shuttle so that is I think a little higher intensity use than we had expected. Exhibit

COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: Perhaps if there's any good news there it's that there doesn't seem to be any negative impact from a parking or circulation standpoint beyond what people were expecting.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Anyone else? Any questions? Mr. Moore?

1 MR. MOORE: Thank you. I hope not to be here long. I have a number of different issues with 2 the Office of Planning report, but I'll try to just 3 highlight them so that we're not here all night. 5 First let me say that I respect Mr. Fondersmith. He is had a long and distinguished 6 history as an officer of the Office of Planning and 8 I respect that. However, we don't always agree and tonight is one of those instances. 9 10 First let me say that --11 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: He needs a little 12 workout, so go ahead. Give him one. 13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: He's not eligible 14 to use the center. 15 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: It's not that kind 16 of workout. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Touché. Touché. 17 MR. MOORE: First of all, Mr. 18 19 Fondersmith, on page 7 of the Office of Planning 20 report you indicate that George Washington 21 University has the ability to sensitively manage the 22 wellness center to avoid potential impacts. And I 23 want to say thank you. Thank you. Because you're 24 absolutely right. 25 On page 8 of your analysis, however, you

point to the Brailsford & Dunleavy study which says that 15 to 25 percent is not uncommon for a similar facility and you say that this means the underutilization is not as great as it seems compared to other facilities. What does that count? What does that mean in terms of land use? What impact does utilization have an issue as a land use issue? Isn't that an operational issue for the university and not a land use issue for the Zoning Commission?

MS. McCARTHY: Let me just answer that,
Mr. Moore. I think what that was directed to is
that the university had argued strongly that one of
the reasons it should be permitted to increase
utilization of the facility was because it was being
under-utilized and so we were merely responding to
the fact that in fact it did not appear that underutilized when compared to other facilities.

MR. MOORE: The Office of Planning report bases its conclusions on its supposition that the facility is under-utilized, but isn't it a question of numbers and not who those numbers represent? Isn't the impact question a question that relates to the numbers and not who those people are because they all have the same impact?

MS. McCARTHY: Well, no.

1 MR. FONDERSMITH: No, they don't. MS. McCARTHY: No, because that's our 2 point is people who are on the campus anyway because 3 they're students or people who live next door have a 5 very different impact than people who are driving across town and parking at 6:30 at night on the 6 7 street. 8 MR. MOORE: Where in the university's application is the university asking for people who 9 10 drive across town and park on the public streets? I 11 think what the university --12 MS. McCARTHY: The President's Club. MR. MOORE: The President's Club. We've 13 14 already said the people are already there. 15 MS. McCARTHY: No, the President's Club 16 is not already there. There are a few members of the President's Club who are faculty members. 17 They're already members of the facility. 18 19 additional people are anybody that pays the money to become a member of the President's Club. 20 21 MR. MOORE: On page 8 of your report, Mr. Fondersmith, you talk about student priority and 22 23 you say that if you add more people to the facility that are not students, this means that adding too 24 25 many users would cause peak use at some of the most

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

25

popular areas such as the fitness center when students want to use the equipment, students are being assessed a fee, might be bumped for other new users. You recall that the peak usage was 12.6 percent of the 1,973 capacity of the facility and 36 percent of 675. At the end of the day, isn't it the university's business and not a land use issue as to whether students get bumped or not bumped?

MR. FONDERSMITH: Well, I think this is where you kind of get into how these numbers are being manipulated and the fact that as approved this is basically to be a student facility. What's tricky, I think that you know, about the capacity thing is that one number is based on square footage and fire marshall's thing and then the university's has come forth with a different capacity number which still, however, doesn't reflect all of the spaces in the thing. But, what you have is a situation where there are certain areas in the facility that at least at certain times will be more used and to try to cram in effect additional users in is hurting the basic purpose. So that's one of the things we meant by the ability of the university to sensitively manage this facility, both for the benefit of the students, first of all, and also in

/

terms of impacts on the community and so on.

MR MOORE: Thank you. On page 10 of your report you say that since the Office of Planning formerly supporting offering memberships to all residents of Foggy Bottom West End, the Office of Planning in its November 2002 report supported offering up to 3,000 memberships to the residents of Foggy Bottom West End. Yet, in this report, it says that the Office of Planning recommends that the 240 members of the President's Club would have an adverse impact, when if you add the 240 members of the President's Club to the current application, we're talking about less than half of those who the Office of Planning had recommended at no impact in its November 2002 report. Are you not?

MR. FONDERSMITH: Well, of course we were very glad to see the university scale back the overall numbers. We said presumably up to theoretically 1,000 memberships. If you remember, the 3,000 figure that the university suggested before included workers in the area and presumably there was an effort there to cast the net kind of widely down as far as the State Department, down to Constitution Avenue, I think, to in effect change the nature of the facility.

that we would support before residents of the community on the assumption that in almost all cases they would walk in, we say here it's certainly logical now that the university has scaled that back to 102 memberships, all of which might not be used. In two residential buildings that are immediately adjacent to the facility, we certainly think we can support that.

But what we meant here, since we did say

Let me make one other point that we said in the report and which I neglected to say and that is we think it's very important that these memberships, however the Commission decides to allow them, are on this class of users business. In other words, if they're not used in one class, they go unused, they don't roll over in some way. Some of these memberships that add up in our recommendation to a little over 1,000 additional users just might not be used at all, so the number might be in fact somewhat smaller.

MR. MOORE: Thank you. Just a couple more questions. On page 10 of your report you indicate in talking about the President's Club you react to the university experts finding that adding the President's Club members as requested would

17

19

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

result in nine new vehicle trips on a typical weekday. You say, "While this estimate of additional vehicle trips is relatively small, this could provide additional transportation and parking impacts to the adjacent neighborhood." You say "could." Isn't it also true that it could not?

MS. McCARTHY: It certainly is true that it could not. I think what we were suggesting there is that we thought that was a very low estimate. And as I just indicated, if getting a free membership or a low-cost membership to the health facility is a benefit of the President's Club, then we think it might increase the number of people who would join the President's Club for that purpose and who would be most likely to be heading there on their way out from the office, just dropping by, parking, using the facility and then keeping on going at home. It's another reason why we proposed a three-year time limit because if it turns out at the end of three years without the President's Club and with all these new students in the dormitory that there is no adverse impact, you could come back and begin to be increasing the numbers at that point in time.

MR. MOORE: But do you have any evidence

1	for the record that the addition of the 240 members
2	of the President's Club would, instead of could,
3	cause an adverse impact?
4	MS. McCARTHY: The Office of Planning
5	did not do a traffic study on the project.
6	MR. MOORE: Thank you. Then you talk
7	about in that same paragraph that adding the
8	President's Club membership would expand how the
9	wellness center is used. Well, aren't there 275
10	President's Club lockers in the center right now?
11	MS. McCARTHY: I haven't counted them.
12	MR. FONDERSMITH: That's our
13	understanding. That was the figure given us from
14	the university.
15	MR. MOORE: If that is so
16	MR. FONDERSMITH: Apparently built
17	despite, you know, the original order.
18	MR. MOORE: And aren't there members of
19	the President's Club there at the center now? Well,
20	you said there are 25, aren't there now?
21	MR. FONDERSMITH: There are 25 there now
22	because what we understand from you, from the
23	university, is that they are faculty members also
24	and therefore they're entitled to use the center in
25	that role.

MR. MOORE: So the expansion of the President's Club wouldn't necessarily expand an existing use, would it? That's expand the nature of the use there now because they're already there, aren't they?

MS. McCARTHY: No.

MR. FONDERSMITH: No, not 270 of them.

MR. MOORE: There are 275 lockers.

MR. FONDERSMITH: Right.

MR. MOORE: Yes. Okay.

MR. FONDERSMITH: Now there are 275 lockers, but there are 25 faculty members who happen also to be, you know, members of the President's Club who are using it.

MR. MOORE: On page 11 of your report the Office of Planning recommends not allowing the additional class of guest memberships. Allowing guests even in small numbers, and you knowledge it's small numbers, begins to change the nature of users of the wellness center. Isn't that a policy and not a numbers issue? I mean, if adding guests of the university, parents of students there, would have no adverse impact because of noise, because of traffic or any other objectionable condition, isn't that the absence of impact by these guests coming to the

university?

MS. McCARTHY: But where did you show
that those guests who may come in their own separate
care along with the person with whom they're
visiting who may be likely to come at the same time
as the person that they are coming in with, which
presumably is also likely to be during the peak
hour. We thought those were all reasons to suspect
that in fact that would significantly exacerbate
whatever adverse impact there might be and what we
felt that what had been proposed, this notion of
there would be 25 and at that point in time there
was a person at the desk that was going to tell two
people standing in front of that person that the one
could use the facility and the other one was going
to have go home, that that seemed unlikely to be an
enforceable system.
MR. MOORE: I'm glad you asked the
question where did we get out notion of no impact

and I'll tell you.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well, see, you're asking the questions now. You're not --

MR. MOORE: Well, I'm just responding. She asked --

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: We're not having a

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

	76
1	conversation. I really would like it to just be
2	cross examination.
3	MR. MOORE: All right.
4	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: You want to rebut
5	something at the end, you're welcome to.
6	MR. MOORE: All right. In reaching that
7	conclusion, had you considered the findings of the
8	Brailsford & Dunleavy firm?
9	MS. McCARTHY: We did address the
10	Brailsford & Dunleavy report.
11	MR. MOORE: In reaching your conclusion
12	as to no impact, had you read the report and the
13	testimony of Grove Slade
14	MS. McCARTHY: We did.
15	MR. MOORE: that it would have no
16	impact?
17	MS. McCARTHY: We did.
18	MR. MOORE: In reaching your conclusion,
19	had you read the recommendation of your own District
20	of Columbia Department of Transportation that the
21	approval of this application would not have an
22	adverse impact on the traffic system of the city?
23	MR. FONDERSMITH: Let me find the Grove
24	Slade because I think, as we say, we're talking
25	about relatively small numbers. But, on page 4 of

1	the Grove Slade updated analysis they say, "Guests
2	and members would most likely drive to Foggy Bottom
3	campus, although usually there for some other
4	reasons other than to just use the wellness center."
5	And for purposes of the analysis that they did, they
6	assumed that 100 percent of these guests would drive
7	and then they thought that they would use the
8	university parking garage. Now, that's their
9	assumption whether the percentage driving is that
10	much or not. But that was their assumption.
11	MS. McCARTHY: It was also based on a
12	survey of the existing members of the President's
13	Club who are not entitled to use the facility.
14	MR. MOORE: The Office of Planning has
15	surveyed the existing members of the President's
16	Club that are not entitled to use the facility?
17	MS. McCARTHY: No. Grove Slade surveyed
18	the members of the President's Club.
19	MR. MOORE: And Grove Slade found that
20	it would have no adverse traffic impact, is that not
21	correct?
22	MS. McCARTHY: That's what I'm saying.
23	Based on the existing membership, but one of the
24	reasons that we were concerned about the Grove Slade
25	estimate was that it did not take into account what

might happen should joining the President's Club and therefore being allowed to use the fitness facility become the driver of a new set of members who were joining the President's Club because they were interested in using the fitness facility.

MR. MOORE: One more question. It's probably a two-part question. On page 12, I read the Office of Planning continues to believe that extending evening hours beyond 10:00 p.m. could be accommodated. Could be accommodated. Thank you for that. But staying open until 1:00 a.m. seems too late. What does "seems too late" mean?

MS. McCARTHY: It was trying to make an assessment of what's a reasonable bed time for the people who live around there. I mean, if you go bed at 11:00 or 11:30 and you are awakened, that's one thing. If you are trying to go to bed and it's 12:30 or 1:00 -- or if you're asleep and it's 12:30 or 1:00 and you are awakened, that's a far greater inconvenience. We felt it seemed like 11:30. That may be -- because, you know, Mr. Fondersmith and I are night owls. Now, people that go to bed at 10:00, you know, we've been trained over the years of late attendance at Zoning Commission sessions, you know, to stay up late, but people like Ms.

1 Miller may be, you know, turning in at 8:00 and therefore -- oh, 9:00 -- and therefore, to her, 2 being awakened at even 11:30 may be late. 3 MR. MOORE: In reaching that conclusion, 5 did you assume that the campus closes down at 11:00, when you thought that seemed too late? 6 MS. McCARTHY: Well yes, but as I pointed out, one of the things that makes the Office 8 of Planning sensitive to adverse impacts is the 9 10 location of this facility, one and a half to two 11 blocks away from a low-scale residential 12 neighborhood immediately adjacent to a residential condominium and less than one block away from an 13 elderly housing project. So all of those meant that 14 15 there is the potential for adverse impact of noise and number of users from this facility because of 16 where it is located. If the rest of the university 17 campus has students at the Marvin Center or Smith 18 19 Center, or Lizner Hall or dormitories, they're not 20 necessarily immediately across from a set of residential uses. 21 MR. MOORE: I would just note here that 22 23 all of the property owners that surround the health and wellness center --24 25 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Mr. Moore?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

MR. MOORE: -- have issued letters of support.

MS. McCARTHY: Well you know, it's interesting you should mention that because when I was looking at the newest letter from the property company at the Remington, they indicated their support of the Remington using it and therefore they said supporting the zoning case. But I didn't see any language that specifically said that the Remington was supporting expanding the use of the facility to all the different classes of users that the university had said. Now, maybe that was in your further conversations with them, but just in the letter that I looked at it wasn't clear that the Remington was in full support of fully opening up the facility.

MR. MOORE: Last question. When you reached the conclusion that 11:00 seemed too late, were you aware that the university hospital located several blocks up the street is open 24 hours?

MS. McCARTHY: Yes, I'm glad you mentioned that because that was another reason why we were concerned about the capacity of the nearby streets to accommodate additional parking demand at 6:00 to 8:00, which is also a prime visiting time at

1	the hospital.
2	MR. MOORE: Were you aware that there is
3	going to be a 700-bed dormitory across the street
4	that is open 24 hours?
5	MS. McCARTHY: Well, or there will be a
6	700-bed dormitory this fall, yes.
7	MR. MOORE: And that the Marvin Center
8	at the university is open 24 hours?
9	MS. McCARTHY: But the Marvin Center is
10	toward the interior of the campus.
11	MR. MOORE: And that the Gillman Library
12	is open until 2:00 a.m. in the morning?
13	MS. McCARTHY: Which is also toward the
14	interior of the campus.
15	MR. MOORE: The point I'm trying to make
16	is that this isn't the only facility
17	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: You can make your
18	point on rebuttal, but if you have any other
19	questions, that would be good.
20	MR. MOORE: I have no further questions.
21	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Thanks.
22	Mrs. Miller, did you have any questions for the
23	Office of Planning?
24	MS. MILLER: I didn't get the report
25	until 4:00 yesterday afternoon and I've only gotten
	II

1 half way through it because I had a meeting last night and one today. So, I'll have to cover what I 2 can in my testimony. 3 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Thank you. 5 Maybe you want to stay up there. I think we're about ready for you. I don't think there are any 6 other Government agencies represented here tonight. 7 8 So, I think we're ready for the ANC report. MS. MILLER: Well, we have written 9 10 extensively on this subject that's going on. I've 11 got four cartons at home this tall full. 12 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Just on the wellness center? 13 MS. MILLER: On the wellness center. 14 15 started in 1992 and the first one was refused. And 16 I'd like to read you from the -- I don't know 17 whether everybody got a chance to read the original order. 18 19 Okay. It says, "Offering the use of the 20 facility to anyone who is not a student, faculty member or staff person from the Foggy Bottom campus 21 22 such as alumni, neighbors and those from other 23 campuses will create an adverse traffic impact." And it does. And right now, Virginia Avenue is so 24 25 jammed you cannot move on it.

_

But the next thing is the purpose of the facility is not to promote athletic uses for the neighbors, alumni or anyone who is not a student, faculty or staff person from the Foggy Bottom campus. And of course they have been violating that. And that the reason they approved it to start with, because they insist it was not going to be a high-intensity use. It was on the periphery of the campus in the middle of a residential neighborhood. And Mr. Moore keeps saying they're all approved on that block. I don't think Dr. Cruiser approved of it and I don't think they've offered him a membership, although he's brought suit for what they've done to his house.

I'd like to review some of the things that we have turned in. And one of the things is, first off, this is making a commercial use in a residential neighborhood. Georgetown tried this and what they did to get around the problem was they had to start paying taxes on the athletic center. So they might keep that in mind because GW right now doesn't pay any taxes. Anything they ever make, they could lose.

And it's supposed to be a low-intensity building and that the people who testified, and he

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

did testify, he was very upset, the one who has the other health centers, that it would create a problem. You can't compete with a person who doesn't pay taxes when you have to pay taxes, there's no way you can compete with them, and he would be very upset about that.

And another thing was the reason we haven't formed a committee is because the other night you put into the record the fact that you can never get an accurate count of the students and they're not in compliance, not on the number of students, not on the fact that they operating outside of the campus without approval of the Zoning Commission and I gave you all copies of the areas outside of the campus where they are currently operating and it shows that when you go to the Internet and take a look at it, that they are moving their commercial offices and everything off of the campus and using the residential area. And I added an addendum to it when I found out they also have taken over 2100 M Street. GW uses that for an administrative building. And they're supposed to have approval when they do that and they haven't got it.

And they keep wanting to reach out to

us. We would just as soon they kept their hands to themselves and kept their hands off of our property. We're tired of this outreach they've got. They've taken over 21 apartment buildings. They've taken over most of my building. And let me tell you something, they might want to exercise until 1:00 or 2:00 in the morning, but when they come home, people are trying to sleep and you can't sleep. We're up to 3:00 and 4:00 in the morning from students coming in making noises.

And of course it's nice and quiet.

They've been limited. It's been working. What the BZA first approved has worked. It has protected the neighborhood. It has limited the activity and with all these thousands of students that are now coming in there, and there's going to be almost 1,000 more students on that corner.

And the one thing I want to say about that bus loading and unloading, you can not unload and load a bus on 23rd Street. It's illegal.

That's a major artery and you're not supposed to do it and it's being done by also commercial people right now at Columbia Plaza to feed tourists that are coming to town. And I brought that to the attention of the DDOT and of course they've never

seen an adverse impact, nor has Mr. Slade ever seen an adverse impact, in particular on the hospital.

You should have been around when we took up the hospital.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: How about the wellness center?

MS. MILLER: I'm coming back to it.

They mentioned that the hospital is open 24 hours.

I should have brought some pictures tonight to show you that they are delivering at 3:00 in the morning when the Zoning Commission said they couldn't and they shouldn't, not before 7:00. Now they wake up the neighborhood from one end to the other.

And we feel that to change this would be almost tantamount to changing the campus plan area.

Now, we've got a problem going on down there now and at my meeting last night I found out they're going to add an extension to keep you from keeping the underpass and turning right into 24th Street. Now let me show you what happens.

This is on G Street. Okay? When you come down Virginia Avenue and can't take the underpass, you come to this horrible intersection and you have to make a right. You go just a quarter of a block and you have to make a left. That's

where your health and wellness center is. That's where the square 43 and they, by the way, have four violations right now in public space that I have contested. That's just across from there. Okay?

Now one of the problems on trying to come down there is the fact that they have built, and by the way, they gave the Remington \$300 to dig up their parking lot so they could put the underground into the Square 43 dormitory, whatever they're calling that thing, and then they also -- the Oddfellows, they bought their old building, built them a new building and gave them parking spaces. So all of these people, they have essentially paid to support them and we don't feel that's a very nice thing to do.

And I hope you had a chance to take a look at what I filed on the letter that we brought in the other night that our lawyer tried to get put in refuting the number of students they have because they're trying to say the Mount Vernon campus is separate, but all the Mount Vernon campus comes down to the Foggy Bottom campus. But they don't want to include that 450 in their count, nor do they want to include the students they have moved off campus. They don't want to include that in their count.

I had one more point I wanted to make

and I'm sorry I'm not better prepared tonight, but things have been a little rough in Foggy Bottom, to say the least. You think it can't get rougher, and it gets rougher.

This is the thing I gave you all showing you all of the places off campus, there are two of them, that they're using, and you can find it on the Internet, and they don't count those students in their total. And there are two of them there, two maps. I had to add an addendum because we found out about the 3100 M Street. That's one and this is the other one. I hope you take a look at it and see how far off campus these people have gone. And I understand that there's another thing coming up in court, which I don't quite understand, but I called a lawyer tonight to try to find what it meant and it's called, I had it written down, it's --

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: You want to spell it?

MS. MILLER: If I could spell it, I could say it, but my problem is -- pre-conclusion order. And it's coming up on the 13th of July. And my lawyer friend who had been a judge in the Government, he said he'd never even heard of the word. But it's coming up on the 13th of July and he

25

understands that, and he tried to explain it to me, it would mean that you couldn't change something. Now my understanding was that the court had never made a decision on the Howard Johnson, because that's three or four blocks outside of the campus, and that those other buildings that they're still using, they have never been determined whether they can continue to use them any more than can continue to use Columbia Plaza. If you could have listened to the tenants last night berate the manager for the noise and the inconvenience of some of the students, not all of them, some of them are very nice, but some of the students are just too much and they told him last night about the stomping, the smoking, the things that are going on on the balconies that they're not supposed to do and he's told the policemen to go up there, there's not supposed to be more than what's supposed to be in the apartment after 10:00. Over that, out.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Anything else about the wellness center?

MS. MILLER: The other health clubs in the area close at 10:00 and we feel 10:00 is sufficient time for anybody who wants to exercise and would be a good idea if these kids would study.

1 AFterall, they're going to be the ones running our country and I would appreciate if they'd study a 2 little harder and play a little less. Thank you. 3 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. Any 5 questions for Mrs. Miller? COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: Ms. Miller, 6 would you say that the current wellness and fitness 7 center is operating well, that you're pleased with 8 its level of compatibility with the neighborhood? 9 MS. MILLER: We have had no adverse 10 11 feeling at this point, but then that 800 dormitory 12 across the street from us hasn't opened and they're in violation of public space on the back, the front 13 and the 23rd Street side. But it has worked our 14 15 reasonably well, because as he said, it's not a 16 major use and it's not supposed to be a major use, which is what they're trying to turn it into. 17 COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: Were you 18 19 surprised also to hear that such a high percentage, 20 almost one would consider a vast majority, of the 21 Mount Vernon campus students are using the wellness 22 center today? 23 MS. MILLER: No, we've been trying to tell you all that all along. They're down there all 24 25 the time and those buses, the air in Foggy Bottom is

1 worse than any other area in the city because of the population from cars, because it's a parking lot 2 23rd Street is a parking lot and Virginia 3 Avenue is a parking lot. 5 COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: But would you say it's fair to say that with the current 6 population of the wellness center there's no adverse 8 impact on the community? MS. MILLER: Not at this time. But then 9 10 the dormitory hasn't opened and there's been some 11 impact from the 250 student that are in 12 fraternities. 13 COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: Okay. 14 you, Ms. Miller. 15 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Anyone else have 16 questions? VICE-CHAIR HOOD: Madam Chair, I just 17 wanted to comment on something Ms. Miller said. She 18 19 mentioned that she would hope that the university 20 would keep their hands to themselves. 21 But let me just say this, Ms. Miller, I believe it would be, because I think we mentioned 22 23 this or we were reminded of this once before about the community not coming up and willing to meet with 24 25 the university, I would insist it and I would hope

2

.

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that the community would try to do that, try to

mitigate in some of the issues that you bring in

here today, hopefully, I know this was going on for

a long time, some of those issues may be resolved

before you get here. I'm not saying you're going to

resolve all of them, but some of them can be

resolved hopefully when you get here. Sometimes

it's better for those who are impacted and involved

to try to satisfy and make those decisions and come

to some type of resolution as opposed to four or

five people who just go by what we're hearing as

opposed to those who are directly impacted. So I

would encourage the community and I know you are a

hard worker out there in that area and especially

with your ANC, but I would encourage you all to try

to get together and get to the table and let's

mitigate some of these issues.

MS. MILLER: I'd like to bring to your attention, we did try for six solid months and got nowhere. We tried private meetings for luncheon, got nowhere. All we heard about was how terrific they were, how wonderful they were. And then they try to make arrangements behind our back with the person we had hired to be our traffic person. We

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

did try.

1	VICE-CHAIR HOOD: Let me just ask you
2	this, would you have a problem if the expanded use
3	of the wellness center included the Trustees, the
4	Board?
5	MS. MILLER: Absolutely. They can
6	afford to pay their own. And on top of that, the
7	President's Club has not been very successful either
8	because they've opened up it up to students now and
9	are selling students wine and beer. For your
10	information.
11	VICE-CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Thank you.
12	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Mr. Moore, did you
13	have any questions?
14	MR. MOORE: No.
15	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. Thank
16	you, Mrs. Miller.
17	All right. Now we'll take persons in
18	support. Any persons in support, just come and have
19	a seat at the table. Anyone else?
20	MS. JACKLES: Hello. My name is Cynthia
21	Jackles. I live at 2450 Virginia Avenue N.W. and I
22	brought to Mr. Bastida my proposal for an additional
23	100 Foggy Bottom residents. Did you all get a copy
24	of it?
25	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes.

MS. JACKLES: Does everyone have it?
CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes.

MS. JACKLES: Okay. I'm involved in a group of people called Friends and we meet with GW monthly to talk about noise and issues and to work together. So there is a faction of the community that is in favor of GW.

As my letter said, I moved in 1999 to Foggy Bottom as an alum to take advantage of the resources of GW. And while I can exercise my mind by taking classes, I can't exercise my body and that just doesn't make sense in this day and age. You know, the theory that the overall, you know, wellness of a person is many things.

So I'm proposing that 100 additional members of the community on a first-come-first-serve basis be allowed to use the facility. I live a block away and I don't see why as an alum -- I don't own a car and I don't see why some of us who want to use it and want to pay should be precluded. I am a public servant. I work for Washington Metro Area Transit Authority and I can't afford L.A. Sports Club or the Watergate. Sure, I'd love to go there, but the reality is I have this wonderful facility across the street and there's quibbling about 13

percent usage. It's amazing. I would think that a facility, whether commercial or university, if it only gets 13 percent usage, it's kind of a waste of resources. So I feel there's a community that

really, you know, could use this facility.

And also, the late hours, students can congregate on the street corner anywhere and make noise. To allow them to exercise to late hours gets rid of stress. So I would think they would be quieter when they came home rather than, you know, coming and talking in their apartment say at 11:00 at night. Perhaps they have another place to go. They can't go to the bars like we could at 18 and drink, so why not give them hours of health facility.

So, I also feel that the classes, the first three classes that were proposed that didn't talk about the rest of us in the close proximity and who are alums as well, School Without Walls will probably not impact the 6:00 to 8:00. Those kids are going to go from 3:00 to 5:00 and go home for dinner. When you think of Saint Mary's, the Section 202 housing, a lot of the elderly aren't going to exercise, but hopefully at some point GW Will get its exercise programs, its exercise science and

1	medical things together and make real programs.
2	They're not going to use the machines by and large.
3	And I also feel the Remington isn't going to have
4	much an impact on it as well and the Oddfellows who
5	don't live in the neighborhood, I don't think that's
6	going to be much of an impact. So I feel that this
7	extra 100 people is really of a value to a lot of
8	people who could take advantage and are not being
9	considered at this point.
10	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. Any
11	questions for Ms. Jackles?
12	COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: I'm sorry. I
13	didn't catch your name at the beginning.
14	MS. JACKLES: Cynthia Jackles. I have a
15	letter dated May 10th that I submitted to
16	COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: I'm sure I
17	have it here.
18	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: It came in our
19	supplemental.
20	COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: I'm sure I
21	have it here, but are there any other exercise
22	facilities on the campus that you are allowed to
23	use?
24	MS. JACKLES: There is nothing else
25	well, they've converted the Smith Center to more

1 intercollegiate practices, so that's really been limited. So no, there's no other facility for us to 2 use. And so for alums to be precluded from using 3 this, those of us who can walk, it just doesn't make 5 sense. No, there are no other facilities. COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: So if you were 6 to join the President's Club, you wouldn't be able to use the Smith Center? 8 MS. JACKLES: I don't have the money to 9 10 join the President's Club, just like I don't have the money to go to the L.A. Sports Club. 11 12 volunteer with a couple of scholarship organizations. I've been involved in the Elliot 13 School. I've been involved in other ways in the 14 15 university, but not as a monetary donor. 16 COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: Thank you. 17 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Anyone else have questions? Mr. Moore? Mr. Hood has a question. 18 19 VICE-CHAIR HOOD: I understand that you 20 want to extend the 100 additional members, but I'm still have an issue, and I brought this up with Mr. 21 22 Barber, how actually do we see this working because 23 if I'm not in that 100, and I understand exactly where you're coming from, but if I'm not in that 100 24 25 and I live in the neighborhood, then I have a

problem.

2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	

24

25

MS. JACKLES: That's because there's a limit here. You're looking to limit it, so I came up with a number that sounded reasonable so that this class would be included. Sure, we'd like to open it to more people and I would use it on the weekends when it's hardly used and I probably would take advantage of the exercise classes which may be students don't take advantage of, but you know, I'm not the expert on the numbers, but sure, if we could open it to more, maybe more people would want to use it. But it would be on a first-come-first-serve basis. I don't know how GW would promote it. would tell this group that's active in trying to come up with some community projects or how they would advertise in the local paper. I don't know. But I guess it would have to be first-come-firstserve. I mean, it's the city's limit. It's not mine. I would extend it.

VICE-CHAIR HOOD: Speaking of that, and I appreciate, I'm glad somebody is meeting with the university, but this Commission is bound by giving the ANC great weight and that's not just in this case, that's across the board.

But there's something else you mentioned

1	and I'm not trying to belabor the point, but there's
2	another way when you look at things. I also run in
3	the morning. After I get through running, I'm hyped
4	up for the next four or five hours. And your
5	statement that if we let it stay open until 1:00,
6	then it will be less intense. But I don't know
7	about anybody else, but once let me finish
8	once I exercise, I'm ready for the next four or five
9	hours. But I'm sure it would take me four or five
10	hours to wind down if I left out of GW at 1:00.
11	MS. JACKLES: Everybody's different.
12	When I come out of an exercise class with some
13	girlfriends, they're starving to death and I'm not.
14	So I think every human being reacts to exercise in a
15	different way. I'm really calmer, takes away the
16	stress and it calms me down. So, I think
17	VICE-CHAIR HOOD: You satisfied the
18	discussion. Thank you. You said exactly what I
19	wanted to hear. Thank you. Because your first
20	initial statement was that they wouldn't be as
21	stressed and they would be tired. So you answered
22	the point I was trying to make. Thank you.
23	MS. JACKLES: One is calmer.
24	VICE-CHAIR HOOD: We're good. We're
25	good.
	1

1 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. Anyone else in support? 2 (No audible response.) 3 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right. Any 5 organizations or persons in opposition that would like to testify? Anyone else in opposition, now's 6 the time to take a seat at the table. Okay. 8 MS. SPILLINGER: Good evening. My name is Barbara Spillinger and I am vice-chairman of the 9 10 Foggy Bottom Association and a former chairman of 11 ANC 2-A. 12 I hadn't planned to testify this evening, but since I've been sitting here through 13 all of this, I thought I would just like to make a 14 15 couple of comments. The Foggy Bottom Association submitted a 16 letter on November 25, 2002, I testified on December 17 2, 2002 and we also submitted a letter February 18, 18 19 2004, all of which I believe have been distributed 20 to the members and you've had an opportunity to see 21 them. One of the things that bothers me about 22 23 this issue is the way it has come about. was first proposed, the community insisted that the 24 25 building was too large and that being built for

__

student use well into the evening hours should be placed in the interior of the campus, rather than on the periphery. It argued that this site was far better suited for dormitory use which would house a specific number of students, rather than be available to the entire student body. But, we did not prevail and the health and wellness center was

built where it is, near the residential community.

And the fact now that the university says it is under-utilized and they want to expand it and open it up is just another example of the university's consistent habit of saying one thing to gain initial approval of a project and then attempting to change the ground rules to fit its overall, but not previously-enunciated position.

And it's one of the things that has happened over and over again in the community and we find particularly disturbing.

The second comment I would like to make is that there are other sport centers in the area. Yes, some of them are expensive, more so than others. But if this sports center is opened up to a larger group of people, you're putting a non-profit tax-supported sports center into competition with like taxpaying businesses and I think you should

1 keep that factor in mind. And I want to correct one thing that Ms. 2 Miller said. When she said that the President's 3 Club was opened up to students now, she was thinking 5 of the University Club and not the President's Club, which is a different institution. 6 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. 7 8 MS. SPILLINGER: And I saw Mr. Barber shaking his head about wine and beer to students. 9 10 I'd be pleased to answer any questions you might 11 have. 12 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. Any questions for Mrs. Spillinger? Any questions? Mr. 13 Jeffries? 14 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Yes, actually I 15 16 have a question. 17 MS. SPILLINGER: Yes. 18 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: What would you 19 say about an organization, you know, having the 20 right to sort of revisit, you know, sort of demand issues around particular operations and so forth? I 21 22 mean, let's say two years ago the market said one 23 thing and so therefore you sort of reflected that in 24 your operations and then two years later you're at a 25 different place. I mean, in your estimation is it

1	possible for an institution to sort of reconsider?
2	MS. SPILLINGER: Well, obviously things,
3	basic factors do change.
4	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Yes.
5	MS. SPILLINGER: And changes have to be
6	taken into consideration.
7	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okay.
8	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Mr. Moore, any
9	questions?
10	MR. MOORE: (No audible response.)
11	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right. Thank
12	you, Mrs. Spillinger.
13	MS. SPILLINGER: Thank you.
14	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Good to see you.
15	Okay. Now would you like to do any rebuttal?
16	MR. MOORE: Yes. The intent is not to
17	be long, but there are a couple of issues that arose
18	during some of the cross examination and some of the
19	direct testimony that we feel we need to address.
20	First, Mr. Barber, I think that Ms.
21	Miller made just one allegation and we'll respond to
22	it and that's that the university paid people to
23	support them. Is that true?
24	MR. BARBER: No, that's not true. If I
25	may, I'm not going to respond to all of the

allegations, but when there's an allegation of wrongdoing and bad faith, I think I have to respond. In fact, the allegation that we paid people to

support this project is simply not true.

Remington people, as recently as this week, have been coming to me to support this project and, Ms. McCarthy, I take issue with you, they supported the application and that was clear in their testimony.

Changing. You know, the idea that we came to the Commission to get it built under one premise in order to change it later, we always had this vision for this project. The reason why it was limited by the Board of Zoning Adjustment on their view allegations of traffic impact and we don't think that's borne out. We don't think it has any validity. But I think we need to keep our eye on the ball of what the objection will impact its claim is traffic and we think we can address that issue. But this vision is always what we had for this project.

And let me go to the President's Club.

The President's Club is not cheap. It's \$1,000

membership and \$700 a month. And so it's for people

who want to pay for certain amenities. But people

who can afford to do that, as Ms. McCarthy said, can go anywhere. But I think that supports our position. The only people who are likely to do it are people who already have or are developing a relationship with the university, people who are coming here, people like the Board of Trustees, people who believe in university and already have a vested interest. If they don't have that interest in university, are not already coming here, chances are they'll take their money and they have plenty of options in the city and plenty of options all over the region. So I think because of the way we've structured it and the limited number, I think the

the traffic impact, which again I think is a key issue. Even the Office of Planning says it's marginal and I will let Ms. White address that. I'll leave it at that. Thank you.

President's Club is clearly within a reasonably-

defined group of people that the university should

be interacting with. We think we've fully address

MR. MOORE: Ms. White, Ms. McCarthy and the Office of Planning don't believe Grove Slade's report. At least they don't give credit to Grove Slade's conclusions, or the conclusions of Brailsford & Dunleavy or its own Department of

Transportation. Would you just speak to the issue of the President's Club and guests of the university and the parking and traffic impact that that would have?

MS. WHITE: Sure. Mr. Moore, I'm sorry, but I'm going to have to take a step back to the campus plan for just a second and try to remember some of the analyses that we did at that time.

What we found back in 2000 was that the university represents roughly 20 percent of the traffic in the general vicinity of the campus, going through the campus. So although this is great that the university is in the midst of a downtown urban setting, it also can be viewed negatively by the neighbors and people who don't understand, they associate the regional traffic problems in the area with the university and that's, you know, really not a fair situation. I just wanted to talk regionally for a second.

And now let me address the specific issues about adverse impact. There are, I think we said the number of 270 President's Club members and what we did from our survey is we found, what I said is people do not go to the gym every day. So that means that of that 270, we're saying that only 30

2

3

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

percent of those people would be there on any given day. And this is ever higher than the Brailsford & Dunleavy number of 25 percent. So roughly a third of that 270 will be there on any given day. So we're talking about 90 people in a day. Now we also did our survey and we found that only 18 percent of that 90 drive. The rest come by transit, they walk, they're at the university for some other business. So if we look at 18 percent of that 90, that's 18 per day. So I want to back our numbers here with this simple math in front of us all here. Eighteen per day. That's distributed throughout the day, so that's where we came up with that nine in an hour.

Now 18 per day, there are 80,000 vehicles that go through that campus on a daily basis. You can count traffic from now until every day next year and you will have a variance of traffic greater than 18 vehicles per day. When you're talking about 80,000 vehicles, you cannot feel 18 vehicles a day. That's what is meant by adverse impacts. And when we strongly say that you do not feel the impacts of this project, that's what we mean by no adverse impact. Thanks.

MR. BARBER: And I'm sorry, one other comment. If you think it's appropriate in terms of

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

the President's Club members, the university would be willing to offer as part of the package for their membership, a discount to the university parking garage to act as an incentive to park in the university parking garage. We don't think the numbers will be that big, but again, if there's concern about them parking on the streets, we would be willing to add that discount as part of their membership package to further address that issue. Again, we've heard, we know it's not a huge issue, but if there's lingering concern, we'd be willing to put that on the table.

MR. MOORE: Questions that the Commission might have?

COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: What was the level of traffic service through those intersections today? Was is its functioning capacity? Is it really effective, or is it congested and poorly performing?

MS. WHITE: Well, like I said, the first part, when we look at a traffic analysis like this for an existing facility, one where you're just changing the operations, is we want to understand the level of magnitude and so since we saw such a small level of magnitude, we didn't feel it was

-

,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

necessary, and DDOT certainly agreed, to do what we would typically do, to go out and do a traffic analysis, a level of service analysis of each of the intersections just because the level of magnitude is so small.

Now to answer your question, from time to time, yes, there is traffic congestion. I can not dispute that. There are intersections that operate at level of service D, if I can remember, because I've been working with the university for probably seven years on all of their cases, some that operate at level of service D, which is acceptable to DDOT. Some at lower levels. Some at E, some at failing from time to time and it varies, but the bottom line is that this order of magnitude is too small to be realized.

Question I had and this is for George Washington
University, if you find that the President's Club is
not a successful package to get enough members even
with this membership offer to the health club, would
you look at possibly in the future changing the
requirements for the President's Club, the criteria
of joining the President's Club if you find it's not
a successful business venture? Do you see a time at

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

which you might lower it so perhaps the fees aren't so high and still offer the same amenity?

MR. BARBER: Certainly. Certainly in operating a facility like this, we would take a look at our operational procedures from time to time to see if they work well. And if the question is the fee that we've set written in stone so it won't be changed, no. We certainly would take a look at it from time to time. I think the fee is less important to us than the service it provides, the outreach which we're trying to achieve. We don't have to have, you know, 270 members. You know, we have a capacity for 270 and I think we should be allowed to go up to 270, but I don't think the university is going to be overly concerned that, you know, it's 250 and we have 270 members. So, what we want to do is be able to reach the people who are friends and supporters through that membership and we think that number, that it can accommodate up to 270 is not going to be a significant number given who's already there and given the 145 that are additional.

So, I hope I've answered your question. You know, we'll take a look at that fee, as well as other parameters of the operation. We will manage

it for a couple of reasons. We want to make sure that our students, that are our primary concern, have full access. But we don't envision the President's Club impacting that. But also whether we're reaching the kind of outreach to the kind of supporters that we want to reach. Yes, we would look at that from time to time. Did I answer your question?

COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: Yes, I think so. I think I was focused more on changing the business strategy and what if in the future the definition of the President's Club becomes something much less substantial and more people were interested in being a member at that level. But I think having a cap structure of a certain number at least prohibits it from going beyond that.

MR. BARBER: oh, yes. Yes. the physical capacity of the layout, the locker rooms that, you know, provide the amenities, there are separate locker rooms, you have your own locker, etcetera, etcetera, don't permit any amount over 270 as a maximum.

COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: Who did you envision using this if the original construction agreement prohibited alumni and President's Club

members from having access to this space? Why did you build such a large facility for them?

MR. BARBER: The 270 we didn't view as particularly large, but two reasons. One, as we said from the beginning, our view of this was to ultimately to realize what the original goal was, to have a facility that served the community in a broader sense, the university community in a broad sense and we always thought it should include these other parties. We recognize the order that limited it to students, faculty and staff and we have made some usage. We had hoped that we could show through time that the practice of what's happened to date has not caused any objectionable impact and that we would be able to come back to this Commission to show that a broader usage of the President's Club would also not create an objectionable impact.

COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: Am I understanding correctly that you're changing the use of the Smith Center to be an intercollegiate facility and moving all of your fitness component out of the Smith Center and into this health and fitness or wellness center?

MR. BARBER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: Why are you

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	electing to move the squash courts then from the
2	Smith to which their function is intercollegiate?
3	MR. VECCHIONE: The squash courts in the
4	Smith Center are not regulation. They're American
5	squash courts, not international squash courts.
6	International squash courts are a lot larger,
7	they're wider, etcetera. So that's why we wanted to
8	move the squash team or, you know, generate the
9	squash team so that it can play at the health and
10	wellness center. We wouldn't be able to remodel the
11	Smith Center in order to accommodate that.
12	COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: Thank you.
13	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Any other
14	questions? Mrs. Miller, did you have any questions
15	on the rebuttal testimony? You don't have to. You
16	could just stay right there, relaxed in your chair.
17	MS. MILLER: You were talking about the
18	traffic in that area, she was, and about DDOT. They
19	have never seen an adverse impact. Okay?
20	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: What's the
21	question?
22	MS. MILLER: The question is, the
23	traffic impact in that area are all the
24	intersections operating at F level. Are you aware
25	of that?

1 MS. WHITE: No. MS. MILLER: They all operate at F 2 If you don't believe me, ask DDOT. level. 3 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Thank you. 5 Anything else? MR. MOORE: Well, Madam Chair, it's five 6 minutes to 9:00. By my account, we'll be out of here at 9:00 if you just give me a few moments for a 8 closing statement. 9 10 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Sure, if you 11 promise that you'll be done by 9:00, that would be 12 great. MR. MOORE: Absolutely. Absolutely. 13 Madam Chairperson, members of the Commission, we 14 15 thank you for your time and close attention to our 16 presentation. The evidence or record shows that the 17 university's mission with respect to the center is 18 19 to serve the entire community, not just students, 20 but the entire community in which it is located. 21 That is the position that the university took in 22 1998, that is the position the university took in 23 2002 and that is the position it takes today. That includes students, faculty, staff, its Board of 24 25 Trustees, important friends of the university,

,

parents and guests of students, faculty and staff and the people who live in the university's community. That has always been the purpose for which this and other university facilities are created.

For the Office of Planning to suggest otherwise, very respectfully, is just wrong. Wrong for it to presume to speak for the university in determining the intended uses and policies of the center and wrong for it repeat the erroneous presumption to the Commission.

The correct for this special exception is whether the proposed use, as revised, will become objectionable to neighboring property because of noise, traffic, number of students or other objectionable conditions. The evidence shows that all of the neighboring property owners except the Oddfellows have submitted supporting statements into the record. The Oddfellows of course has not submitted a statement in support or opposition, but the university has said that that organization is willing to accept memberships that the university has proposed to make available if this application is approved. In addition, many of the owners and residents of neighboring properties have submitted

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

statements of support.

With respect to noise, the university has testified under oath that it has received no complaints from anyone with respect to noise at any hour of the day or evening, or on any day of the There is no evidence in the record submitted by anyone that would support a finding to the contrary. That fact closes the issue and supports both ends of the university's request to increase the memberships at the center and to set the closing hour at 1:00 a.m. on all days. There is no evidence in the record that either action will adversely affect the use of neighboring property because of noise.

You've heard the record reports and testimonies of the university's expert traffic consultant, which has conducted studies of the current usage at the center at all hours of the day and the evening and all days of the week. studies conclude that the center's membership can be increased by 3,000 without having an adverse impact on traffic or parking and a second study made in conjunction with the university's revised request, Grove Slade logically found that increasing the membership by the lesser number of 1,316 would also

have no adverse traffic impact.

Adding to the wealth of evidence, the D.C. Department of Transportation concurs with Grove Slade and recommends that the membership of the center be expanded as proposed by the university, plain and simple, black and white.

With respect to the closing hour, the D.C. Department of Transportation concurs with the Office of Planning that an 11:30 p.m. closing is fair enough. But neither agency says why. The D.C. Department of Transportation does say that extending the closing hour to 1:00 a.m. could have adverse impacts, but it doesn't identify them. At the same time, counter-intuitively it says that there is little traffic and much parking at night. So the D.C. Department of Transportation must be referring to some other objectionable condition, but it doesn't say which, leaving that part of the Department of Transportation recommendation without support in the record.

On the other hand, the university has submitted reports from Grove Slade and by its facility's planning consultant Brailsford & Dunleavy that comprehensively examined the justifications and impact of a later closing hour and give reasons

2

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

supporting their conclusions that a later closing

hour will not adversely affect the use of

neighboring property because of noise, traffic,

number of students or other objectionable

conditions. As to the impact of an increased number

of persons using the center, the university's expert

traffic consultants, the D.C. Department of

Transportation and the Office of Planning have

concluded that an increase of 3,000 memberships

would have a negligible impact on traffic, parking

and neighboring property due to the relatively small

increase in memberships and limited automobile

usage.

Each report and testimony of course logically

supports a lesser number of users at the center.

The Office of Planning offers no findings of a basic

or underlying nature explaining how a small increase

in the President's Club members and weekend guests

of the university would adversely affect neighboring

properties. How is it, for instance, that 3,000 new

members is okay and 1,300 is not when both have been

documented to be without traffic impact? That is

sufficient reason to reject the Office of Planning's

recommendation to limit the scope of memberships, a

recommendation that may be based on politics rather

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2122

23

24

_ _

25

than zoning and in any event is totally and rightfully distinguishable and unrelated to the land use issue that is before this Commission.

Finally, we have consistently emphasized on this record that the university's belief that the proper measure of zoning impact should be related to the number of the users and not the classes of users. However, we have separated the university's proposed numbers into classes at the request of the Commission and to provide structure for the parking and traffic analyses. However, the bottom line is that there is no zoning reason, no zoning reason related to traffic, parking or number of students that memberships in the Lerner Health and Wellness Center should not be available to others as proposed. There is a wealth of evidence in the record supplied by experts that is unrebutted to support such a finding and conclusion. In these circumstances, the application for special exception relief must normally be approved.

Thank you for listening and for your fair consideration of the record evidence. It is 9:00.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr.

Moore.

T	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I ODJECT to one
2	of his statements.
3	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well, you'll have
4	to tell him outside.
5	Mr. Bastida, we had a request for one or
6	two pieces of information, I think?
7	MR. BASTIDA: That is correct, Madam
8	Chairman. I think that you requested projection of
9	the number of users after new dormitories are built?
10	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: That was Mr.
11	Hildebrand asked for that.
12	MR. BASTIDA: And there were some
13	questions about the compliance of the university
14	with Condition 10.
15	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I believe Mr.
16	Barber handled that.
17	MR. BASTIDA: Right. You didn't want
18	any further
19	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I don't know if
20	there's anything else to say.
21	MR. BASTIDA: So there is only then that
22	item.
23	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
24	MR. BASTIDA: When does the university
25	believe that they can provide that information on

1	the conclusion of facts, I mean the finding of facts
2	and conclusion of law and when does the ANC could
3	present findings of facts and conclusion of law?
4	MR. MOORE: Ten days.
5	MS. MILLER: I would like a month.
6	MR. MOORE: For us to produce documents?
7	MS. MILLER: No, his document, the
8	finding of facts and conclusion of law.
9	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: What did you say?
10	How many
11	MS. MILLER: I suggested that we should
12	have a month and the reason I'm suggesting is
13	because we have got four cases coming up.
14	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I don't think
15	you'll have a month.
16	MS. MILLER: Well, I think we need it.
17	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: But I think it's
18	not reasonable in the context of an individual case.
19	MS. MILLER: It is considering the
20	number of cases we've got coming up and the number
21	that we have had. I mean, we're such a little body.
22	We don't have help. We don't have lawyers. And we
23	don't have money.
24	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I understand that.
25	MS. MILLER: We have to do all the work

1	ourselves.
2	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Right. And I
3	understand that.
4	MS. MILLER: Minimum of three weeks.
5	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I think three weeks
6	will work. Three weeks will work.
7	MS. MILLER: Prefer a month.
8	MR. BASTIDA: Then the university will
9	present the request for the further information on
10	can you do that by Friday, May the 21st and serve
11	it to the ANC?
12	MR. BARBER: Is that with the findings
13	of fact?
14	MR. BASTIDA: No.
15	MR. BARBER: Just the request for
16	information?
17	MR. BASTIDA: Right.
18	MR. BARBER: All right.
19	MR. BASTIDA: Yes, and that would be
20	served on the ANC and this office by 3:00 on Friday
21	the 21st. And then you will serve the findings of
22	fact and conclusion of law on the ANC by Friday,
23	June 4th at 3:00. Today's the 13th.
24	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Is June 4th three
25	weeks?

1	MR. BASTIDA: Yes.
2	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Three weeks
3	is June 4th.
4	MR. BASTIDA: That's slightly over three
5	weeks.
6	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
7	MS. MILLER: Slightly over two, but not
8	three?
9	MR. BASTIDA: No, it is one, two, three.
10	It is slightly if it will be the 14th, then it
11	will be three weeks exactly. Today Thursday.
12	MS. MILLER: All right. The 14th would
13	be better.
14	MR. BASTIDA: No, I'm saying if today is
15	the
16	MS. MILLER: It's practically the 14th.
17	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well, then it's
18	practically three weeks.
19	MR. BASTIDA: It's over three, yes.
20	Okay?
21	MS. MILLER: We have to have those
22	findings of fact in when?
23	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: June 4th.
24	MR. BASTIDA: By the 4th at 3:00. And
25	at that time, you also could have the response to
	II

	124
1	the submission that the university is going to
2	produce by the 21st of May and serve on you. So
3	that gives you two weeks for that for that.
4	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And just keep in
5	mind, I mean, you're not compelled to do findings of
6	fact and conclusions of law.
7	MS. MILLER: We understand.
8	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: You're invited to.
9	MS. MILLER: We understand the problem,
10	but every little bit helps because if you don't
11	clarify the issues, they get
12	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
13	MR. BASTIDA: Thank you, Madam Chairman.
14	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. So
15	everyone's clear on the dates for submission and
16	then we will make our decision at one of our regular
17	meetings.
18	MR. MOORE: Could you be so kind as to
19	project a date? If all the information is on by
20	Friday, June the 4th, when would the Commission
21	first be able to decide this case? It was filed in
22	April of 2002.
23	MR. BASTIDA: The first opportunity will
24	be
25	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well, there's been
	NEAL D. CDOSS

	125
1	stuff going on.
2	MR. BASTIDA: The first opportunity will
3	be on the June meeting.
4	MR. MOORE: Which day is that, Mr.
5	Bastida, please?
6	MR. BASTIDA: That would be the 14th of
7	June.
8	MS. McCARTHY: Madam Chair?
9	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: What? We don't
10	make promises.
11	MR. BASTIDA: I mean, it's the norm of
12	the Commission to say at one of the regular
13	scheduled meetings. That's the first one. The
14	Commission do not commit themselves to take it
15	anything and date.
16	MR. MOORE: Thank you.
17	MR. BASTIDA: You know that.
18	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes, what he said.
19	That's right. Okay? But if you're interested in
20	finding out what's on the agenda for our meeting,
21	feel free to call Mr. Bastida about a week prior and
22	see what's happening.
23	And I'd like to thank you all for
24	bearing with us tonight and being patient with our
25	questions and all that good stuff. So, have a good

			126
1	evening.	Thank you.	
2		(The meeting was adjourned at 9:07 p.	.m.)
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
11			